

The United States has agreed to support Nigeria's development plans with \$225 million in loans and grants. Since Nigeria is practically agriculturally self-sufficient, the plans call for the further development of a young, but vigorous industrial sector. This sector will include cement production, plywood fabrication, oil refineries, and rubber processing.

Hopefully, Nigeria's goal of reasoned, sustained economic growth, attained in the context of a stable and free society, will serve as an example to the other emerging states of Africa. We commend today both the goal and the methods by which it is sought. On this fifth anniversary of its independence we extend our congratulations for what has been achieved to date and our warm encouragement for Nigeria's continuing development.

Final Review for Proton Accelerator Sites

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1965

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, the Atomic Energy Commission announced recently a list of sites which will undergo final review by the National Academy of Sciences for the planned \$300 million-plus 200 Bev. proton accelerator.

Indiana sites in Marion County, near Indianapolis, and near Dana, in western Indiana, are on this final list.

The next step will be up to the National Academy's Site Selection Committee, and, of course, the competition will be rough.

Many experts participated in drawing up the Indiana proposals, and an Indiana site would fully satisfy the technical requirements set by the Atomic Energy Commission.

There has been a tremendous bipartisan effort at all levels of local and State government in Indiana to present the advantages a Hoosier home for this space-age accelerator would afford the Nation and our scientific endeavors.

Indiana cannot be overlooked if the site selection is determined by the technical, topographical, geographical, and scientific criteria laid down by the Government.

Indiana meets every requirement and condition, and we certainly hope this selection will be made on this basis.

There has already been, however, reports that delays in the selection may be due to political factors. If true, this is unfortunate and is an injustice to the literally hundreds of people who have worked for a fair consideration of Indiana for this project.

It is appropriate that we also discuss some of the broader factors which relate to the eventual selection of a site. There are many regional factors which should be considered in the selection of this site.

The Midwest has two overall and important assets which are pertinent to the placement of an accelerator:

It is centrally located, making the facilities of the accelerator easily accessible to qualified scientists throughout the country.

The great universities of the Midwest have produced much of the top scientific talent of the Nation. Owing, however, to the placement of the bulk of Government research facilities on the east and west coasts, there has been a considerable and harmful scientific emigration from the Midwest, which in the long run could damage the outstanding quality of education at Midwest universities.

Of the eight major accelerators built in the United States to date, only one has been located in the Midwest—at Argonne, Ill. In addition, virtually all the major nuclear development and production facilities have been built outside the Midwest.

By contrast, the States of Indiana, Ohio, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Michigan produced nearly 30 percent of the doctorates in the natural sciences at work in America in 1962.

There is clear evidence that the Midwest has been getting the short end of the deal. This applies not only to atomic accelerators and other nuclear facilities, but also to other programs of advanced technology and research.

This is clearly documented in the Government and Science Report No. 4 of the committee which I serve upon, the Science and Astronautics Committee of the House of Representatives.

Additional evidence is available through the report of the Committee on the Economic Impact of Defense and Disarmament, published July 1965, which contains percentage breakdowns, listed by States, of Defense Department prime contract awards and National Aeronautics and Space Administration direct procurement awards.

This report shows that while Indiana has 2.5 percent of the population of the United States, it is receiving only 2.2 percent of the Department of Defense prime contract awards, and even worse, only 0.1 percent of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration procurement awards.

We can assume that whereas Defense Department prime contract awards heavily reflect the direct production of goods, such as guns, airplanes, and electronic equipment, NASA procurements relate to even more highly sophisticated and research-oriented space-age technology.

These statistics on Indiana and others which I have examined for Midwestern States make it abundantly clear that on a per capita basis, our area is not in any way receiving an equitable share of advanced research-oriented Government contracts, measured by NASA direct procurement awards. The Midwest is receiving only around 25 percent on a per capita basis.

Even in the area of production for the Defense Department, the Midwest lags—by nearly 50 percent—behind an equitable per capita share.

This is an extraordinary and disturbing state of affairs. In the Midwest are located many of the finest universities and much of the best production capability in this Nation. Yet when it comes to Government facilities and contracts, the Midwest is getting shortchanged. This is particularly true with respect to highly technical research facilities, of which the planned Atomic Energy Commission accelerator is the best current example.

Inequities are uncomfortable and unpleasant, particularly if they are as unjustified and unexplainable as are those affecting our State of Indiana and the entire Midwest.

The Midwest has demonstrated its talent and capabilities. I certainly think it is about time that it has a chance to put them to maximum use.

If Indiana is bypassed in the location of the AEC accelerator, it will not be a competitive decision, but pure power politics. I fear at this time that the degree of competition involved in this project will result in a political judgment.

The State of Indiana—and the entire Midwest—will be watching and awaiting this decision with interest. Should this installation go to Texas—or another politically "correct" area—our worst suspicions will be confirmed.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 1, 1965

The House met at 10 o'clock a.m.

Rev. William J. Cumbie, executive secretary, Mount Vernon Baptist Association, Alexandria, Va., offered the following prayer:

*O God, Thou art my God, I seek Thee,
My soul thirsts for Thee;
My flesh faints for Thee,
As in a dry and weary land where no
water is.*

*So I have looked upon Thee in the sanctuary,
beholding Thy power and glory.*

*Because Thy steadfast love is better than
life,*

My lips will praise Thee.

So I will bless Thee as long as I live;

*I will lift up my hands and call on Thy
name.—Psalm 63: 1-4 (RSV).*

Almighty and eternal God, our Heavenly Father, we have received all good and perfect gifts from Thee. We raise our voices in praise and thanksgiving to Thee. Be unto us this day a very pres-

ent help; give us that spirit of truth and the love that makes us men and women after Thine own heart. Deliver us from the temptation to be wise in our own conceits. Lead us into that genuine trust in Thee that sees all of life as a stewardship of Thy blessings. Cause us, we pray, to be instruments of Thy peace that men and nations may learn to live together more perfectly. Let Thy presence hallow these halls and sanctify these Thy servants, that Thy kingdom may come and Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. Through Jesus Christ our Lord we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1384. An act for the relief of Theodore Zissu; and

H.R. 6726. An act for the relief of William S. Perigo.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1778. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to create a Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1906, as amended;

H.R. 3141. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the educational quality of schools of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy, to authorize grants under that act to such schools for the awarding of scholarships to needy students, and to extend expiring provisions of that act for student loans and for aid in construction of teaching facilities for students in such schools and schools for other health professions, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3314. An act to require premarital examinations in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5597. An act to relieve physicians of liability for negligent medical treatment at the scene of an accident in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 9042. An act to provide for the implementation of the Agreement Concerning Automotive Products Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9985. An act to provide for the mandatory reporting by physicians and hospitals or similar institutions in the District of Columbia of injuries caused by firearms or other dangerous weapons; and

H.R. 10304. An act to provide for the mandatory reporting by physicians and institutions in the District of Columbia of certain physical abuse of children.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 9042) entitled "An act to provide for the implementation of the Agreement Concerning Automotive Products Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. CARLSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1314. An act to amend the Street Readjustment Act of the District of Columbia so as to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to close all or part of a street, road, highway, or alley in accordance with the requirements of an approved rede-

velopment or urban renewal plan, without regard to the notice provisions of such act, and for other purposes; and

S. 1719. An act to authorize compensation for overtime work performed by officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police force, and the White House Police force, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 89-187, appointed Mr. HART, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. MILLER as members, on the part of the Senate, of the Father Marquette Tercentenary Commission.

AUTOMOTIVE PRODUCTS ACT OF 1965

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 9042) to provide for the implementation of the Agreement Concerning Automotive Products Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 344]

Adair	Gilligan	Murray
Addabbo	Goodell	Nix
Anderson, Ill.	Grabowski	Ottinger
Andrews,	Hagan, Ga.	Powell
George W.	Halleck	Redlin
Andrews,	Hanley	Resnick
Glenn	Hansen, Iowa	Reuss
Aspinall	Hardy	Rhodes, Ariz.
Blatnik	Harsha	Rivers, Alaska
Bolton	Hays	Rivers, S.C.
Bonner	Hébert	Robison
Bray	Henderson	Roncillo
Burton, Utah	Hollifield	Roudebush
Cahill	Hosmer	Rumsfeld
Callaway	Johnson, Okla.	Scheuer
Carey	Keogh	Scott
Carter	Kornegay	Shibley
Celler	Laird	Smith, Iowa
Clausen,	Latta	Springer
Don H.	Lindsay	Steed
Colmer	Long, La.	Sweeney
Cooley	McCulloch	Thomas
Craley	Mackie	Thompson, N.J.
Dawson	Martin, Ala.	Thompson, Tex.
Dorn	Martin, Mass.	Toll
Dow	Matthews	Tupper
Duncan, Oreg.	May	Utt
Dyal	Michel	Willis
Evins, Tenn.	Mize	Wilson, Bob
Flynt	Morgan	Wyatt
Frelinghuysen	Morris	Yates
	Morse	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 339 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AUTOMOTIVE PRODUCTS ACT OF 1965

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas to send the bill H.R. 9042 to conference? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MILLS, KING of California, BOGGS, KEOGH, BYRNES of Wisconsin, CURTIS, and UTT.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS—JAMES MADISON MEMORIAL BUILDING

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 642) to authorize the Architect of the Capitol to construct the third Library of Congress building in Square No. 732 in the District of Columbia to be named the James Madison Memorial Building and to contain the Madison Memorial Hall, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 642), with Mr. WELTNER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the joint resolution was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, the House Committee on Public Works is privileged to bring before you today House Joint Resolution 642 authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to construct the third Library of Congress building on square No. 732, to be named the James Madison Memorial Building and to contain a Madison Memorial Hall and for other purposes.

Before explaining the need for this very important structure, I would first like to thank all of the members of the House Committee on Public Works for their sincere efforts in reporting out this resolution, and I particularly want to commend our chairman, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], and the ranking minority Member on the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL] for their interest in this proposal and for their help. I want to thank our beloved Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], and the members of his House Office Building Commission for their efforts in behalf of a third Library of

Congress building; and I wish also to thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLISON], who is chairman of the Joint Committee on the Library, and also the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], who was instrumental in getting the James Madison Memorial program started. Without the help of all these gentlemen and others it would have been impossible to bring to you today a bill that represents a clear compromise of different views that once prevailed, concerning this new proposed building.

Mr. Chairman, I want to explain to my colleagues today the dire need for immediate action to construct a third Library of Congress building on square No. 732, that is located just east of the Cannon House Office Building. Mr. Chairman, the need is great and the hour is late. The Library of Congress is bulging at the seams and has been, for too many years.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, the Library of Congress is not an ordinary library. It has a long, historical tradition in our national background. It is used today by scholars and students from all the corners of the earth.

The collections of the Library of Congress number well over 44 million items. The two buildings that now house the Library are wholly inadequate and as a result the Library was forced to move 118 million printed catalog cards and 510 staff members into 85,000 square feet of space in the Navy Yard Annex, which is more than 1 mile from the Library. A small aircraft paint hangar is also being utilized in the general depot in Middle River, Md., 50 miles from the Library. Even with this additional scattered space, I have here today photographs of the deplorable conditions existing in the two Library buildings here on Capitol Hill. Many of the rooms are windowless, cellar areas; the books in many areas are stacked from the floor to the ceiling; and passageways are so crowded that only one person at a time can move through the corridors. Here is a photograph showing that on the second floor exhibition hall much of the exhibition area that once housed documents pertaining to the Presidents, the rough draft of the Declaration of Independence and other historic displays has now been crowded out by shelves, books, and work space. This makes work very difficult and is certainly unsightly.

With every school, Members of Congress, and thousands of students and scholars from all over the world using this facility, the problem is growing worse by the day. The Legislative Reference Service that provides valuable assistance to Members of Congress is crowded into an almost unbearable work area as depicted by the photograph before you.

Mr. Chairman, I could talk all afternoon about the dire need for the third Library of Congress building. I am sure if any of my colleagues have not been over for an inspection of the two existing buildings they will become convinced immediately upon such an inspection. In addition to the need for a third Li-

brary building, the Congress has expressed its desire on a number of occasions to provide a fitting memorial to James Madison, the fourth President of the United States who was one of the greatest of our Founding Fathers. James Madison rightly deserves to be honored by the Nation for which he struggled so diligently. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], and others introduced legislation that would provide a James Madison Memorial building on square No. 732. Others had proposed that a simple addition of the Library be built on square No. 732 and still others proposed that the site be preserved for a future fourth House Office Building.

I am happy to report that the proposal before you today would authorize a building embodying most, if not all, of the various views expressed. We propose to construct a third Library building with a suitable hall set aside for the express purpose of honoring James Madison. It will be called the James Madison Hall. And, in addition, we propose to name the building—Library of Congress, James Madison Memorial Building. We feel this will suitably honor this great champion of freedom and at the same time take care of the pressing Library of Congress needs. We also propose that the building be set back from the property line a sufficient distance in order to have proper landscaping and shrubbery around the building to break the monotony of a mass complex of stone buildings in one general area. We thereby feel we can help beautify the Capitol and provide a suitable structure.

It is now tentatively contemplated that four stories be below the ground and eight stories above.

Mr. Chairman, the other body has passed a similar resolution giving jurisdiction for drawing the design plans to the General Services Administration. We felt that the Architect of the Capitol under the guidance of the House Office Building Commission, the Senate Office Building Commission, the Joint Committee on the Library, and a committee to be designated by the American Institute of Architects, will adequately insure that a suitable building design will be offered. This should take care of any criticism that has been directed at the Architect of the Capitol. The other body also provided only \$500,000 for the preparation of plans and did not place a maximum cost on the building. Our committee felt that we should place a maximum cost on this building and the resolution before you authorizes a maximum of \$75 million which includes the cost of preparing plans, architects fees, and so forth. We all recall the experience with the Rayburn Building where the cost kept going up and up, and we felt that a maximum limit should be placed in the bill. I am hopeful that the other body will accept this feeling so everyone will know what the new Library of Congress Building will cost.

Mr. Chairman, President Johnson said in signing the Education Act this year:

As a son of a tenant farmer, I know that education is the only valid passport from poverty.

I say to you in closing that the Library of Congress is doing as much for education, particularly higher education, as any institution in the world. To do less than give them adequate working space will only impede, not broaden, the opportunities for a good education we are trying so hard to give the people of the United States. The outstanding Librarian of Congress, Dr. L. Quincy Mumford, made a very impressive statement before our committee and, among other things, had this to say in support of the third Library building:

Historically the Library of Congress has been a source of pride to the Congress and to the American people. It has been a center of learning and a symbol of this Nation's grand heritage.

It is, I believe, of primary importance that this institution which constitutes a unique natural resource which has been nurtured by the Congress, continue to be such a center.

Mr. Chairman, let us today finalize action on House Joint Resolution 642 and continue to preserve the Library of Congress as a symbol of this Nation's grand heritage, and at the same time justly honor our great fourth President, James Madison. I hope every colleague on both sides of the aisle will support this worthwhile program.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MONAGAN. The gentleman is aware of my suggestion that perhaps we have an oversupply of concrete and stone in this particular neighborhood and, in the tradition of great city planning, that it might be highly desirable to preserve the green area we now have east of the Cannon Building as an attractive breathing-space and to use other space for this proposed new building. I appeared before the committee chaired by the gentleman.

Mr. GRAY. I want to commend the gentleman for appearing before the committee and I want to say his ideas have been embodied in this proposal. We do propose to set back from the property line a sufficient distance in order that we can landscape and beautify the surroundings to give, if you please, some green to what otherwise would be a mass of stone buildings. I want to commend the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. MONAGAN. I do not agree that my ideas have been followed out. The committee did not agree with me, and that it is within its right is perfectly understandable to me. However, I would like to ask the gentleman if he can give some assurance that there will be an attempt made in the design of this building to maintain at least a modicum of the open space that we do have there at the present time.

Mr. GRAY. I will say to the gentleman that this will be done. That is why we are going down approximately four stories in order to get the useful space and still be able to move back sufficiently to do the job that the gentleman wants done.

Mr. MONAGAN. Does this appear in the report?

Mr. GRAY. It does appear in the report. I can assure you as chairman of

the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds that we will follow this matter to make sure. Plus we have the oversight committees that I mentioned before; namely, the Joint Committee on the Library, the House Office Building Commission, the Senate Office Building Commission, and a select committee from the National Institute of Architects, and I am sure all of us join the gentleman in his opinion.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I would like to ask the gentleman if his committee has given consideration to where another House office building would be located in the event Congress should in the future decide to have a fourth House office building.

Mr. GRAY. I will say to the distinguished gentleman from Texas that we also appreciate his appearance before the committee. It is well known that the gentleman proposes that we construct a fourth House office building on Square No. 732 just east of the Cannon House Office Building. We felt the need at the moment is for a third Library of Congress building and a suitable memorial for President James Madison.

But, I am sure you realize that the Congressional Hotel and that area could be made available for a fourth House office building, if and when we reach the time when we feel we need it. I can assure the gentleman from Texas that if the need arises and if I am here, and if I am chairman of this particular subcommittee, I feel that sympathetic consideration will be given to the views of the gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. One suggestion I made before the gentleman's committee was that in the event the Madison Memorial Library is constructed, and I assume it will be and I certainly will not oppose anything for James Madison, I hope consideration is given to the location at some proper place of that very appropriate phrase that James Madison was the author of and which is used in the American creed, which has been adopted by both Houses of Congress and which has been used hundreds of times, the phrase being, "Our form of government, a democracy in a republic."

Mr. Chairman, since that correctly represents the form of government we have, I hope some conspicuous and prominent place will be found for the placement of that phrase.

Mr. GRAY. I appreciate the gentleman's suggestions and I suggest that since he is sitting next to the very distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], he discuss the matter with him, as the gentleman from Virginia is a prominent member of the James Madison Memorial Commission. I know the gentleman from Virginia will be glad to consider the suggestions raised by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAY. I am glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I want to join those who have commended the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] and the committee for bringing this bill to the floor of the House.

This extra space for the Library of Congress, of course, is needed.

Furthermore, we do not have anywhere in the United States an adequate memorial to one of the greatest men in the early history of this Republic, the father of the Constitution, the man who had more to do with writing the Constitution and persuading the American people and the American States to ratify it, than any other one man.

He was one of the great scholars of his day; perhaps, the greatest scholar at the Constitution Convention.

This is an appropriate memorial to a great man and, certainly, it is a needed addition to the Library of Congress. I commend the gentleman from Illinois and the Committee on Public Works for what they have done.

Mr. GRAY. I thank the very distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma, the majority leader, for his contribution.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I hope this bill will pass unanimously.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma, a very valuable member of the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for yielding to me.

I wholeheartedly endorse and support this bill.

Mr. Chairman, this joint resolution not only meets an urgent need of the Library of Congress, but also honors one of the authentic heroes of our Nation's earliest history.

The contribution of James Madison to constitutional government is unparalleled in our history. No other American had more to do with the framing of the immortal document termed by Gladstone "the greatest piece of work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

To us on the Committee on Public Works, it seems particularly appropriate to memorialize this great American statesman and scholar in the manner and form proposed by this joint resolution, authorizing a substantial and long-needed improvement of the Library of Congress.

I hope the resolution will be overwhelmingly approved.

Mr. GRAY. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I supported this bill in the committee, first, because the amendment with reference to the top limitation of money was adopted, and the taxpayers will have some estimate as to what this cost is go-

ing to be. We did not do that with reference to the Rayburn House Office Building or the so-called third House office building.

Mr. Chairman, some 9 years ago I made the same request concerning that building, and I do not believe we would have been in such hot water if we had done the same thing with reference to that building.

Second, Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to see that the proposal that was made when this bill was first introduced, that this should be a utilitarian building, has been agreed to and that this area of the Capital should not be used for a one-purpose memorial-type building; that if we are going to use areas here on Capitol Hill, that use should be utilitarian.

If—and I believe it is proper in this instance to have four memorials, they should be used in conjunction with legislative activities and should be utilitarian buildings.

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman from Illinois and the committee upon coming to that obvious necessity.

Mr. Chairman, if we are going to spend that much money, it should be spent on a building that can be used. This building is badly needed as an addition to the Library of Congress. There is not any question about that.

The Madison Memorial is likewise a good objective, and the setting of a limitation of a maximum amount of money to be spent thereon is in my opinion logical. But I would hope, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois, that in the discussion of this building we do not get any commitments or any suggestions of commitments relating to a fourth House office building. I do not believe the taxpayers yet have digested the \$125 million third House office building. I would suggest that any discussion relating to a fourth House office building at this time would be the most prejudicial discussion that could take place relating to this building.

Certainly, Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman regarding location, that the Congressional Hotel and that entire block is available for future expansion, and has already been committed, and the purchase of it. It has already been purchased as a matter of fact.

They have the building and I would expect if we are going to put in an underground garage, I do not think the taxpayers would object too much if they did something above the ground with that space if it gets crowded and there is a need for more space to be used.

I think to talk about a fourth House building at this time, knowing the other one cost far more than it should, is going to prejudice the entire consideration of this legislation and not help it a bit in my opinion.

Mr. GRAY. I thank the gentleman from Florida very much for his help with this matter.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. KING of Utah. The gentleman made reference to the fact that this bill very clearly fixes a ceiling on the total

expenditure for construction. The gentleman from Florida also made reference to this ceiling. This is a matter of great concern to me. We know of the situation that occurred in connection with the construction of the Rayburn Building. I think we all understand that the image of the Congress was not exactly improved by that operation. I wonder if the gentleman could spell out rather specifically wherein the bill would make it impossible for the construction cost to go above \$75 million. This is a point upon which I want to be certain, before I vote in support of this bill.

Mr. GRAY. I appreciate the gentleman raising the question and I will be glad to answer it.

But before I do, let me again say, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] suggested this amendment which the committee adopted. I think he made a very valuable contribution and if you will refer to page 7 of the bill, section 3, you will see this language:

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed—

And I would repeat—not to exceed—

\$75 million to construct the building authorized by this joint resolution including the preparation of all necessary designs, plans, and specifications.

So this is a definite prohibition against spending any more money than \$75 million.

I might say in that connection that when the estimates were given—and these were preliminary estimates—they estimated that the cost of this building was going to be about \$72,500,000. We feel that \$75 million will do an adequate job for a 12-story building with 4 stories below and 8 stories above the ground, and that this will be adequate to take care of all the costs incidental to the design, plans, and construction.

Mr. KING of Utah. Suppose the building were half completed and that the Architect and the contractors were to report that there were hidden costs or certain things arising that they had not anticipated, and that they had to have another \$10 million in order to do the job properly, without creating a monstrosity. Of course, at such a point we would not be free agents to turn their request down. And knowing the way that we usually respond to such a situation, we would probably give them the extra \$10 million. But I would like to be assured that that will not occur, so that we will not be put in a situation where we will have to make that choice.

Mr. GRAY. The gentleman raises a good point. Of course, that is one of the imponderables of construction and I do not foresee that any such thing will happen. As chairman of the Buildings and Grounds Subcommittee, they would have to justify any such action and I certainly would have to justify it before I could recommend it to the House. I certainly would have to know that it was justified and I know that I speak for every member of the House Committee on Public Works. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] is seated in the Chamber

and I am sure he would agree that we would not entertain any requests for additional funds for this building unless it were absolutely essential.

Mr. KING of Utah. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. I think in view of all this concern about increased costs, I certainly trust that McCloskey is not the contractor.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], the hard working chairman of the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Illinois for the skillful manner in which he has conducted this project, and not only in the subcommittee but before the full committee and also commend him on the magnificent job he is doing on the floor of the House this morning.

Of course, the gentleman has the wholehearted support of the committee and I certainly hope the House will agree with the committee and pass this bill today.

Mr. GRAY. I thank the distinguished chairman and again point out what an effective and helpful chairman of the full committee he has been with these matters.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois has consumed 23 minutes.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, the hearings on this proposal before Chairman GRAY's committee before which I testified was in the Rayburn Building September 8, 1965. My testimony was as follows:

Mr. GRAY. The Chair would like to call our distinguished friend and chairman of the important Committee on Banking and Currency, another great Texan, WRIGHT PATMAN. Will you come forward Mr. PATMAN?

Mr. PATMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GRAY. We are delighted to have you as a witness this morning.

Mr. PATMAN. Thank you, sir.

STATEMENT OF HON. WRIGHT PATMAN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF TEXAS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have noted with some amazement the efforts being exerted by some outside of the House of Representatives to decide what should be done with House properties known as Square No. 732, the land located just east of the Cannon Building.

During the last few years, there have been a series of proposals to use this property, the latest being called the so-called compromise scheme, to cover the block with a building combining the James Madison Memorial and the third Library of Congress building.

I am not opposed to a memorial to our fourth President and great statesman, James

Madison. He deserves to be memorialized just as were Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and others.

Likewise, I am not opposed to a third Library of Congress building. It is urgently needed and long overdue. But I am unalterably opposed to granting a building for these facilities up against the Cannon Building.

However, when the Madison Library or Madison Memorial Building is constructed, I hope there is this phrase put over that building, which I think causes Madison to be one of the greatest men in history. When he said, "Oftentimes we discuss whether our country is a democracy or whether it is a republic," James Madison said that "Our country is a democracy in a republic." So that would be a suitable inscription to go on anything connected with James Madison, "a democracy in a republic."

The reason for my comments is so simple it should be readily understood by anyone. We will need this property as a site of a fourth House Office Building.

Anyone who will look at a map of the Capitol grounds and surrounding areas should be able to recognize that Square No. 732 is the only logical place for such a building to meet the ever-increasing workload of the House of Representatives.

When Square No. 732 was acquired, there was no commitment for the House Office Building Commission or anyone else that this property would be used for a Library of Congress or a James Madison Memorial.

I happen to know a little something about that, because I had bought and remodeled and fixed up a home which I thought we would use from here on out; but it was taken along with the other, which was all right; if it was needed for public use, it was all right with me. But I was an interested party and I kept up with what was going on.

At that time the late Speaker, Sam Rayburn was chairman of the House Office Building Commission, and he told me on numerous occasions that he did not intend to let any building be constructed on that property which would preclude its use as a site for further office facilities for the House of Representatives. The House Office Building Commission did agree to permit construction of a Madison Memorial on a small portion—on a small portion—of this 2-block area with underground space for the Library of Congress. This development, however, was designed so that a future three-sided building for the House could be constructed along First Street, C Street, and Second Street. Later, the House Office Building Commission formally confirmed this agreement on at least two occasions.

Now we are told that the whole area should be given over to a Library of Congress-Madison Memorial Building, thus blocking for all time expansion of the House facilities to the east, and violating the concept outlined by me, by the late Speaker when he said that this property should be preserved primarily for future expansion of the House of Representatives.

No one will deny that the area would make a reasonably good site for a third Library building. But even those committed to short-range planning should recognize that it would be folly to spread library facilities into that square which so logically lends itself to House expansion.

If we examine the Capitol Grounds properties, we immediately wonder why the Madison Memorial could not be put in some of the park areas to the north of the Capitol, in the Senate Office buildings. There seems to be plenty of open land in that area; whereas there has been no such comparable expansion on the House side.

As for the third Library of Congress, certainly any additional facilities should go to the east of the present Library Building.

As proposed to the Joint Committee on the Library in April 1962 by the Architect of

the Capitol, after careful studies authorized by the Congress and conducted by competent architects and engineers, Square No. 732 properties were acquired and paid for under the Additional House Office Buildings Act. And this property is under the control of the House Office Building Commission, chaired by our beloved and respected Speaker, Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, serving with the dean of the House, EMANUEL CELLER, and our colleague, Hon. CHARLES E. GOODELL.

I urge the Commission to take whatever action is necessary to reserve this property for the future needs of the House of Representatives. Such action is dictated by commonsense and good planning, according to my viewpoint.

Now, may I suggest to my friends, the members of this distinguished committee, that we need this area right now. It is more of an emergency for the House of Representatives, and it is more urgent for the House of Representatives use than it is for the Library of Congress.

Now, we have always recognized from Constitution Avenue to C Street on the other side of the Capitol, Northeast, is the Senate's domain. Likewise, they have always recognized that from Independence Avenue to C Street, Southeast, was the House's domain. And we respected each other's domains that way. This is the first time that there is an attempted invasion by outsiders and by the other body, which I deplore. I am sorry that it is coming to that pass.

The House of Representatives, if it properly takes care of the help that the 435 Members have now, they should build another building on that property now. It is needed now.

But, in addition to that, I believe sentiment has crystallized greatly in the House of Representatives in recent months and years to the effect that each Member of the House should have two professional administrative assistants. I think we are doing this country, and our constituents particularly, a great disservice in failing to provide ourselves with sufficient adequate professional help to give us the aid necessary to properly—to properly—take care of and provide the services for the constituents that we have the honor to represent. I feel like it is costing the people billions of dollars a year that would be saved.

Now, the Senate, they have two administrative assistants and even more. I do not envy them for that at all. They are entitled to it. But they are only a hundred Members of the Senate, and they are bogged down very quickly on a few issues; whereas here we have 435 Representatives that are close to the people, elected every 2 years, and the people look to this body.

I find myself in disagreement with my distinguished and able colleagues who want to change our Constitution where that we would be elected every 4 years instead of every 2 years. I have always opposed that. That is not new with me.

I have appeared before the committees every time the question came up, except this time I have not appeared yet—for the reason that the people of this country are entitled to change our Government every 2 years, if there is a bad trend in Government. It is too long to wait 4 years, and if there is a bad trend, because the people have control of the pursestrings of this Nation through the House of Representatives, since certain bills can only be introduced in the House. So the House is a body that is closest to the people, and the people should be able to change it every 2 years, if they desire. But at the same time, each Member should be properly equipped to do their job.

The Library of Congress, as I stated here, they can go east just like the Senate can go east and just like the House can go east. But this is part of our domain. And I

hope that we do not give it up. And do not overlook the fact that it was paid for out of House funds—out of House funds.

And may I suggest, too, Mr. Chairman, that in comparison with the Senate on office space, the Members of the House have 6,128 square feet. That is giving the benefit of some space that is not exactly office space, but the same comparison as with the Senate. And the Senate has 12,850 square feet per Member—over twice as much. And I respectfully suggest that the average House Member, I believe, is just about as busy as the average U.S. Senator.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL,
Washington, D.C., July 7, 1965.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The following information is furnished pursuant to your recent informal request:

Gross space provided for operation of Senate and House in the five office buildings

	Gross square feet
Cannon Building (excluding garage)-----	671,921
Longworth Building-----	599,675
Longworth Building Cafeteria in Courtyard-----	19,368
Rayburn Building (excluding garage)-----	1,375,000
Total, House office buildings-----	2,665,964
New Senate Office Building (excluding garage and including cafeteria)-----	685,250
Old Senate Office Building-----	604,287
Total, Senate office buildings-----	1,289,537

We are using gross square area for this comparison as such areas as readily available, but the net usable areas would average out at about the same ratio as between the House and Senate.

The areas include all facilities in the buildings, except garage space.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

J. GEORGE STEWART,
Architect of the Capitol.

Remember, in our State, for instance, Texas, we have 23 Representatives. We have two U.S. Senators. Well, it is something you would expect, that people are naturally closer to their Representatives. They take more of their problems up with their Representatives than they do their Senators. They are just closer to them.

And when you take 23 Representatives taking care of the will and wishes of the people of that State, just like any other State, that takes the load off of Senators. Naturally the Senators could not do all of it.

But I believe that you will find that the average House Member is just about as fully occupied as the average Senator. I do not know that any comparison of mail has ever been made, and certainly I would not be in favor of making any, because we do not want to do something that would look like we are investigating our colleagues or the other body or anything like that, so I would not think about doing such a thing.

But I suspect, if the facts were known, that the Members of the House, the average Member, is just as busy as the average Senator. And we certainly should not have that discrepancy in office space, that they have more than twice as much as the average Member of the House of Representatives.

SAM RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

I do not look with favor on the criticism of the Sam Rayburn Building. Too often, it appears that whoever the architect is who

gets the contract and does the work, too many of the other architects are too quick to heap unjustified criticism upon him. I am sure that as a profession, architects represent and observe the highest standards of ethical conduct, and I am sure that architects generally are not guilty of this practice. However, it is not uncommon for many architects to quickly point out and criticize anything that the architect selected for the job as accomplished.

The Rayburn Building is built to last a long period of time. If the cost were amortized over the long period of time the building will last, it would be very small and insignificant in comparison to the cost of other Government buildings.

A building with this immense space and footage is, of course, not a minor undertaking. Much has been said about its cost that, I find, conflicts with the simple truths or arithmetic. In terms of cost—\$86,400,000 in relation to its 35,266,000 cubic feet—this new Rayburn House Office Building may be said to be, not an extravagance, but a sound buy and a solid success from every aspect of fiduciary common sense.

COST NOT EXCESSIVE

In truth and in fact, it may be described as a bargain of the first magnitude, except by those who think in the dismal financial language of the 1930's and in the depressed labor market of the same period, the economic evils Sam Rayburn did so much to redress. For example, the Supreme Court at current prices would cost \$4.46 a cubic foot. The Old Senate Office Building would cost \$3.50 at today's prices per cubic foot. Yet this magnificently imposing, ably engineered, brilliantly architected monument in stone and marble cost \$2.45 per cubic foot. On the square-foot basis, the Supreme Court would cost \$90.94; the Old Senate Office Building, \$59; and this new Rayburn Building, \$36.56. This is arithmetic, not rhetoric. It is the sort of Government economy that would have pleased the heart of Mister Sam.

So, Mr. Chairman, I hope that the members of this subcommittee—and I know that they will—give very careful consideration to this proposal and keeping in mind that the Members of the House of Representatives need that building now—need that building now. It is more urgent for all the people of this Nation than the Library, although I am for the Library 100 percent. I am just not for it and the Madison Memorial at this particular place, which is on the domain of the House.

So I want to thank you very much for your consideration and for the consideration of the views that I have expressed.

Mr. GRAY. We thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for taking time out of your very busy schedule to come.

Are there any questions on my right? On my left?

Mr. BLATNIK. No questions, Mr. Chairman, but I certainly want to commend our dear friend and distinguished chairman for the very impressive statement as always, and it is a pleasure to have you here this morning, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PATMAN. Thank you, sir.

Mr. GRAY. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PATMAN. Thank you, sir.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I too would like to commend the gentleman from Illinois for the work he has done on this bill. As a longtime proponent and supporter of this resolution, I am pleased to see it coming to fulfillment and urge its adoption.

Mr. Chairman, for more than 3 years I have been trying to persuade the Congress to make effective and economical use of Square 732, the site selected for the third Library building in the legislation we are considering here today. In recommending this present use for this site, which has become well known as an unimproved grass plot—and one of the most expensive grass plots in the Nation—the Congress is taking a course of which it can be justly proud.

The use of this plot for a third Library of Congress building was the recommendation of the late great Speaker Sam Rayburn, and he was supported by other leaders of this House when he asked the Appropriations Committee for funds for its acquisition as a fine site for the Library annex.

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, joined me in introducing legislation which provided for the needed Library of Congress annex on Square 732, and for its designation as a living memorial to President James Madison. In this he was joined by Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, Senator FRANK J. LAUSCHE, and Senator EUGENE J. MCCARTHY. We were all grateful for the support of the often forgotten people of the Capitol Hill area, the homeowners and businessmen, some of whom had been displaced rather unceremoniously, I fear, from Square 732. If this site had not been used for the third Library building, they would have been displaced a second time, at least some of them, from their homes and businesses on Capitol Hill. I have always felt they deserved much better and more humane treatment from Congress.

For this reason, I would dare hope that this House will move at an early date for the establishment of a Presidential Commission to develop a master plan for the long-range needs of the Congress which will be correlated with the needs of the citizens of the historic Capitol Hill area which is the eastern gateway to the Congress. In this I have introduced legislation similar to that sponsored by Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, legislation, I might add, which meets the views of the ranking minority member of the Senate Public Works Committee, Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER. This Presidential Commission should include Members of the House and Senate and, vital to its success, members from private life, nationally recognized architects, representatives of the citizens of the adjoining historic Capitol Hill area, and experts whose plans would insure the utility and beauty of the Capitol Hill area which the Congress has so unaccountably neglected for so long. In this way the more beautiful Capital called for by Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson could be quickly realized.

The present beauty of the Capitol Hill area is due in large measure to the citizens and businessmen of the area who have labored long and hard to make it attractive and desirable. The Congress from now on must take the citizens of the area into its confidence and work with them to aid its restoration and beautification. The cost of an inflexible and outworn attitude on the part of the Congress is high. On February 24 of this year, the Washington, D.C., Post pointed

out in an editorial on the proposed James Madison Memorial Building, that:

No one argues that the annex is not needed. In fact, considerable money has to be spent each year for private space to store Library material. The senseless delay on this project is as inexcusable as the lack of a master plan for the Capitol Hill area. And so long as there is no master plan similar delays on future projects and attempts to claim additional for parochial interests can be expected.

The need for a new annex for the Library of Congress has been known for some 10 years. Discussions were initiated by the Librarian of Congress as early as 1956, and he presented data to support plans for such a building in 1958 to the Joint Committee on the Library. Congress authorized preliminary plans and estimates for an additional building for the Library of Congress in 1960.

I introduced as early as 1962 a bill to provide for a James Madison Memorial Library Building on square 732 to serve both as a memorial to President James Madison and to meet the actual and pressing needs of the Library of Congress itself. This particular proposal I believe could save the taxpayers of the Nation at least \$20 million and perhaps, ultimately, much more. Dr. L. Quincy Mumford, the able and nationally known Librarian of Congress, testified in part as follows before the Subcommittee on Public Building and Grounds of the Senate Committee on Public Works:

The proposal before you today is the result of careful consideration and reconsideration of all the factors involved. It represents, I think, a reasonable resolution of the Library's need for additional space and the wish to honor a distinguished American, James Madison, with a fitting memorial * * * the location designated will allow for underground access to both of the present buildings. This is a very important consideration because we need to be able to service effectively the vast holdings of the Library in all of the buildings.

I believe, in short, that a single structure commemorating President Madison and providing most of the space now estimated to be needed by the Library is the most satisfactory solution from the viewpoint of economy and efficiency.

It now appears that by * * * utilizing the land both below and above ground to the fullest extent possible and feasible * * * we will be able to meet most of our projected needs.

It is clear from what the Librarian of Congress has had to say on the subject that the work which Senator DOUGLAS and his colleagues and I put into the development of the legislation we sponsored for a James Madison Memorial Library on square 732 was in the national interest, and that our judgment in this matter is fully vindicated. The legislation we cosponsored called for one building, not two as had been proposed by others. It made the acquisition of a second site at huge cost unnecessary, and it provided for the estimated needs of the Library in the most economical and efficient way possible. I am confident that, provided the requisite amount of skill and imagination on the part of the architects is available, and the space both below and above ground is utilized to the fullest extent possible and feasible, we will, indeed, be able to

meet most, if not all, of the projected needs of the Library of Congress.

In closing, I wish to pay a personal tribute to the capable and courageous leadership Senator DOUGLAS has brought to this matter. I think the American people in general, and the scholarly community in particular, owes him a very great debt of gratitude.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it was a pleasure to serve on the subcommittee in connection with this bill because we had an objective that we all desired to reach and we wanted to get the program on the road just as quickly as we could because of the terrific need for this building and the immediate need.

I think the bill we have here merits the support of every Member.

Mr. Chairman, in this year 1965, there have come together here in Washington two building projects of great historical and educational significance for our national capital and for the Nation as a whole.

One is a desperately needed addition to the Library of Congress. The other is a plan to construct a memorial to James Madison, fourth President of the United States. As one of the leading founders and great Presidents of our country—and as a man known to many as the Father of our Constitution—Madison too long has gone without the kind of recognition we have accorded to men like Washington, Jefferson and Lincoln through monuments erected within the District of Columbia.

The plan contained in the legislation before us today is to combine these two projects and construct what will be known as the James Madison Memorial Building. It will be just across Independence Avenue from the main Library of Congress building.

There should be no question but what this plan has great importance far beyond Capitol Hill. From my study of it, one of the things that really impressed me was how the Library of Congress has developed into what is now truly a national library—a library which serves not just our Government and a handful of scholars but which, in one way or another, reaches into every area of the Nation to serve all of our people.

One of the most important national services performed by the Library of Congress is in preparing and making copies of catalog cards for libraries throughout the country. When we go to our local library and search into its files for a book, it is quite likely that the cards through which we thumb were prepared by our national library. An indication of the tremendous growth in the number of publications is in the fact that last year the Library of Congress provided 61 million catalog cards to thousands of libraries, compared with only 14 million cards in 1945.

Over the years, of course, the cataloging and reference information made available in this way has meant the saving of great sums of money for the local libraries which otherwise would have to do this work themselves. Moreover, the extent to which this has standardized

the reference systems of all of our libraries makes it much easier to find the books and other publications we want almost wherever we go.

Another big job of the Library of Congress is to answer inquiries from all over the Nation as to where information can be found. Through its National Union Catalog, it keeps track of the location of books in more than 700 libraries in the United States and Canada. Also, it publishes large bibliographies which are indispensable to researchers who want to know what has been written about a certain subject and where it can be located.

One of the special services of the Library of Congress worth mentioning, particularly in this day and age, is its National Referral Center for Science and Technology. This Center receives inquiries from scientists and technologists in every section of the country and directs them to the best sources of information.

The Library of Congress also stands at the head of the nationwide inter-library loan system. Although it does not loan directly to individuals and organizations outside of the Government, the Library of Congress does make books and other publications available to the public on a loan basis through the local libraries. Last year, it loaned nearly 220,000 books and other items. This program has greatly strengthened the ability of our smaller libraries to serve the public.

There are a number of other ways the Library of Congress gets information into the hands of people everywhere. For example, it acts as the agent for other libraries in obtaining foreign publications. To carry out this function, it currently has about 25,000 exchange agreements with governments and institutions in other countries and, incidentally, is adding more than a million items a year to its own collections through these arrangements.

The Library of Congress also administers the national books-for-the-blind program. With the help of volunteers, it prepares many books in braille, as well as other items like longplaying records, and distributes them to blind persons through 31 regional libraries across the country.

There is considerable duplication, of course, among the materials constantly being received by the Library, so this has enabled it to provide some 5 million items a year to our educational institutions, either by donation or exchange. One of my pleasant associations with the Library of Congress over the years has been in helping libraries and schools in my district to obtain surplus books here.

The Library of Congress is the finest in the world. Except for the difficulty of comparing it with what Russia has, we could say with assurance that it is the world's largest library.

It has come a long, long way since it was first established in a comparative cubbyhole in the Capitol Building in the year 1800. It had to start all over again in 1814 after British troops burned

the Capitol, and half of its collections were destroyed by a second fire in 1851.

In fact, it has come a long way even since 1897, when it was moved into what is still its main building—the one here that is distinguished by its ornate Italian Renaissance style. In the short span of 26 years—since the Library's large annex building was completed—its collections have more than tripled in size while the demands on its services have risen astronomically. Its facilities are terrifically overcrowded, and the need for a third building is made all the more urgent by the accelerating growth of library services throughout the Nation. Other libraries are looking more and more to the Library of Congress for assistance and leadership.

In view of the heavy responsibilities borne by the Library of Congress, it is a shame to see the conditions under which its people have to work and under which large parts of its valuable collections have to be kept. It is obviously difficult in the extreme for the Library to perform its tasks efficiently. Under the circumstances it is nigh on to a miracle that the Library manages to maintain its fine reputation. A walk through the Library, and a few inquiries here and there, will convince anyone of that.

Books are being stacked on the floors, they are being double shelved and they are overflowing into hallways never intended for the purpose. They are packed in so tight in some areas as to assure many days of reckoning and rearrangement as the collections grow. Thousands of volumes of bound newspapers are piling up on the floor shoulder high, and the big room that was designed for a bindery is now filled with map cases almost to the ceiling.

Staff people are jammed up in every makeshift situation conceivable. They are down in the cellars and up in the balconies. They are tucked into little alcoves in the stack areas where it is likely they have to stop working and move when somebody wants a book. They are behind partitions in once-beautiful marble halls where outstanding collections of the Library used to be exhibited and where the acoustics make a typewriter sound more like a machine gun. They are taking up space that originally was reserved for study and reading, and just recently in its annex building, the Library resorted to putting up office partitions in an elevator lobby.

Visiting students and scholars are no better off, having been shunted off into a cellar area that is a sea of abutting desks. They no longer have the quiet and privacy of the little study rooms that were designed for them, for those rooms now are occupied for the most part by staff members.

Nor can it be said there is anything satisfactory about the temporary quarters provided for the catalog division in the Navy yard annex a mile away and for storage of less frequently used materials in an old aircraft paint hangar 50 miles away.

The plain, simple fact is that the Library needs a new building, and that building ought to be under construction at the earliest possible date.

The construction site proposed in this legislation not only is the best available but is the best imaginable. It is right across the street from the main Library building. It is already owned by the Government. Moreover, it is vacant, and it can be built upon immediately.

Additionally, it should be pointed out that the site is a fully adequate one. It covers two city blocks, and there is space enough to set the building back away from the streets so as to permit landscaping that will enhance its attractiveness. In fact, our committee, in its report, directed that this should be done. In doing this, we took into consideration the suggestion made during our hearings by the gentleman from Connecticut, Congressman MONAGAN, that the site be preserved for development as a park.

Originally, it was thought that a memorial to James Madison would be built as a separate project but would include a large underground library facility to house the official documents and other papers of 23 of our Presidents. Now the plan is to include this facility within the new Library building and to provide within it, also, a Madison Memorial Hall featuring various exhibits and statuary. The project will provide more than 2 million square feet of space at a cost presently estimated at around \$75 million.

The Madison Memorial Building will be an especially fitting tribute to our fourth President. First of all, he was an outstanding scholar, and it was Madison who drew up the first list of books for the original Library of Congress.

He was chief author of our Constitution and its first 10 amendments—the Bill of Rights. As President from 1809 to 1817, Madison successfully led his young Nation through the War of 1812, and it was under his administration that the United States emerged as a power to be reckoned with in world affairs.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation is a model of ingenuity in coordinating an urgent need with a deserving tribute. I urge its passage.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the joint resolution. As I stated when I interrogated the gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the subcommittee, since there has been written in a top limitation on the authorization of \$75 million and also a provision for making this a utilitarian building, it is my opinion that this deserves the support of the Members of the House, since we know it is absolutely essential that we have more space for the Library of Congress. If we did not build a Library of Congress annex here, we would have to build it somewhere else, probably to the east of the present second Library of Congress building. This would result in substantially increased cost.

I am not influenced at all by the suggestion relating for a fourth House office building. I do not believe we should even discuss that at this time. We have other places to put that on the Hill presently available.

For those reasons, I support the bill before us.

I should like to suggest one thing, however, since I am not a member of the House Office Building Commission, and, incidentally, I do not desire to be. We have a very fine House Office Building Commission. I have received numerous complaints from people who desire to make use of the library facilities, people such as students and scholars who want to use the Library of Congress, which is recognized as probably the greatest library in the world. They wish to make use of the facilities, and they complain that there is not enough space available for use by the public in the Library, such as study alcoves and areas for the citizenry who pay to use the Library in the form of taxes.

I would respectfully suggest that the House Office Building Commission, in the drafting of the plans, consider providing adequate space for the public for that purpose. As I have said, I have made such a request by letter. I hope that will be done.

I have only one other comment. This joint resolution indicates that our committee, when working together as a team, can do the job. We will have a bill on the floor next week known as the Highway Beautification Act of 1965 bill. I say to the House in all sincerity that the approach of the gentleman from Florida is going to be constructive, and the position of the minority on the bill is also going to be constructive.

It will be our objective to try to correct obvious errors in the bill. I would suggest to the Members on the floor of the House and to others that they should read the minority views on S. 2084, and in particular the list of States contained on page 54 of those views, which States are likely to lose 20 percent of their highway funds, because the bill is written in a manner so that they probably cannot conform by the qualifying date.

Let me read this information. We are going to try to do something about this on the floor or by a motion to recommit.

I read the list of States which may lose funds unless the State constitution is amended, and the amount to be lost, in millions:

	Millions
Alaska.....	\$8.06
Arizona.....	11.62
California.....	69.58
Colorado.....	10.18
Georgia.....	13.06
Idaho.....	5.30
Louisiana.....	18.16
Maryland.....	11.96
Mississippi.....	9.52
Missouri.....	19.62
Montana.....	8.92
New Hampshire.....	3.74
Oregon.....	13.16
South Carolina.....	6.32
South Dakota.....	7.62
Tennessee.....	16.86
Vermont.....	5.02
Wyoming.....	7.58

Those Members who come from those States should give serious consideration to the fact that this bill is going to cut off 20 percent of all highway funds of those States without the States having a reasonable opportunity to amend their constitutions to conform to the requirements of the bill. I say that is very wrong.

The Federal Government is going to get into the business of zoning industrial and commercial areas, and I say that is very wrong.

In addition, it will be possible to spend 100 percent Federal money for beautification off the highway right-of-way, but, on the primary system, only 50 percent on the highway right-of-way. I say that does not make sense.

Our approach is going to be to try to make a sensible, meaningful bill out of S. 2084, which approach will do the job of beautification and at the same time will not put out of business the little businessman who runs a hotel, motel, restaurant or other form of business.

A person who drives a car on the highway and passengers should be able to get needed service information. If the car breaks down they should be able to do something about it. They ought to know where to go to do that.

We shall try to make some sense out of this bill. It is my hope that the House will listen to the debate and will give serious consideration to the constructive amendments—I say again, constructive amendments—that will be offered largely, I assume, by the minority on this other legislation.

I believe we will be able to do an equally good job on that as has been done on this James Madison Memorial Building resolution before the House at the present time.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair advises the gentleman from Illinois that he has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I do not need 10 minutes or 7 minutes. I have long experience on the bench and during that experience I had occasion to see how many cases, good cases, were lost because the lawyer talked too much and too long. So I shall consume very little time. Mr. Chairman, I know of no opposition to this bill. It is a badly needed facility aside from the duty we owe to memorialize this great statesman, the father of the Constitution of the United States, James Madison.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY], has so thoroughly evidenced that, as well as the other Members who have spoken, that I do not see any need for further argument in its favor. I would like to say that in 1960 the Congress passed a resolution to construct a fitting memorial to James Madison who, if he were living today in his old home, would be one of my honored constituents. That resolution for the James Madison memorial required the appointment of Presidential representatives and four representatives from the House and four from the Senate. Dr. Harold W. Dodds, the president emeritus of Princeton University, was selected by the President as chairman of that commission and has

done a noble work. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] has explained this so well, and I think to the satisfaction of the Members, that further need for explanation is hardly necessary.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to join with my colleagues, the gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from Illinois, as well as the whole committee in supporting this legislation which really has been neglected for quite a long period of time. As chairman of the Joint Committee on the Library, I know that the situation as it has been referred to by several speakers, is actually a desperate one. To neglect this need longer is to neglect the country. The Library of Congress is not just a library for Congress—actually it is a library of the United States of America.

So, Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from Illinois and his committee for their expeditious handling of this matter once it really did get on the road. It is a fine piece of legislation with a worthy and needed purpose in many ways. As the gentleman from Florida indicated, it is utilitarian and at the same time it honors this great statesman James Madison. I think the action of this House today would be a compliment to the entire Nation if we wholeheartedly adopt this measure.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am delighted to yield to the Speaker of the House.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I also want to join with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY], the chairman of the subcommittee that handled this bill, and compliment him on the able presentation he has made. I wish also to join with the others who have spoken in support of this bill, along with my very dear and valued friend from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], in urging the passage of this bill. This matter came before me as chairman of the House Office Building Commission. There is an absolute need for an addition to the Library for the services it performs. There is also a need for recognition of this great American, James Madison, both of which needs will be provided for in this bill. I wholeheartedly join in urging my colleagues to pass this bill which I consider to be meritorious legislation and which combines service and, at the same time, recognition to a great American.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, what more do I need?

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly rise in opposition to House Joint Resolution 642. I believe that it is appropriate for the Congress of the United States to take action to give recognition to the great contribution that James Madison made when he served as President of the United States. I also believe that it is appropriate for the Congress

to give recognition to the need for expanding the library facilities of the Library of Congress. However, I also think we should give consideration to the timing of both of these events. I do not believe we should be authorizing the expenditure of another \$75 million in construction funds here on Capitol Hill at this time when our estimated budget deficit for the current fiscal year will exceed \$5 billion according to the estimates submitted this year by the President.

Mr. Chairman, the people of the United States have been concerned about the capital expenditures here on Capitol Hill. In the last 10 years we have spent more in construction funds here on Capitol Hill than in the entire preceding period of our Nation's history from its beginning.

We have spent more on the Rayburn Building in the last 10 years than on the two preceding House office buildings.

We have spent more on the new Senate office building in the last 10 years than on the first Senate office building.

We have spent more on the extension of the east front of the Capitol in the last 10 years than we spent in the entire accumulated cost of all other previous additions to this Capitol Building.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, in each case, the Senate office building, the House office buildings, and the extension of the east face of the Capitol, all of which occurred in the last 10 years, we have spent more of the taxpayers' funds than we spent previously in the entire history of this Nation in the Capitol area.

The Library of Congress is an arm of Congress and, therefore, it represents a further construction expenditure applicable to us. As I say, I do not question the fact that the Library of Congress needs more space. I do not question the fact that these shortages exist, but I do not believe that we should grant an authorization for a major construction expenditure of \$75 million at the present time, when we have the budget deficit that we do.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this represents the kind of expenditure that we should defer until we actually have a balanced budget and can determine that such an expenditure can be made.

It seems to me that we have to use the same selectivity that we as individual family heads have to use.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure all of us have had the same experience, of sitting down with our wife and children and discussing various expenditures that we might make of our own family funds, and I believe that many times we have had the experience of having proposals made by various members of our family, including ourselves, that in themselves are meritorious. Yet, if we decided to carry out all of those proposals at the same time, we would be committing ourselves to a total amount of expenditures which we could not finance with the income we have. Therefore, we have had to make a decision as to which ones we could defer to some future date, when our income might allow it.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this is the same problem exactly with which we are

now faced, and I feel that this is the type of expenditure under the present circumstances that we should defer until our budgetary situation makes it possible for us to expend this sum without adding to our national debt and issuing bonds for this purpose.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER. Is it not true that if we defer this expenditure, it will cost considerably more several years hence and that the need is very urgent at the present time, and we had better go ahead and build it with the facilities and finances that we now have?

Mr. BALDWIN. I shall answer the gentleman in the same way that I commented before with reference to our own family expenditures. At times we have to defer some expenditures because we do not have the income to cover them. I do not believe we should issue bonds and pay interest on them for capital expenditures that we could well defer.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the James Madison Memorial Commission ever since it began its deliberations in 1960, I am gratified to have an opportunity to go on record in support of House Joint Resolution 642.

The first concern of the Commission was to establish a dignified memorial to the career of a man who has been called "The Father of the Constitution." Historians who have studied the deliberations of the Constitutional Convention of 1787 have also referred to James Madison as the "Indispensable Chronicler" of the Convention, and his careful record of proceedings serves as a primary source of knowledge about the beliefs and convictions, actions and attitudes of those who met to create the basic law governing a new nation.

I know all the Members of this House are aware that there has been a great deal of talk about "germaneness" at this session of the Congress. Madison himself, I believe, would have found it singularly fitting and germane that a public building to commemorate his career should also serve the Congress as a library, for he was a keen observer and a careful student with a great respect for the value of facts. During recent years the need for an additional Library of Congress building has become generally recognized. As a member of the Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee I had an opportunity earlier this year to hear testimony from Dr. L. Quincy Mumford, the Librarian of Congress, and his staff which established the dimensions of their current responsibilities. I am sure that any Member who had an opportunity to review that testimony would conclude that we must provide expanded facilities if we are to expect the Library of Congress to fulfill its assigned mission as first library in the Nation.

The proposal contained in House Joint Resolution 642 embodies a happy compromise through which we can meet two desirable objectives at one and the same time. We will properly honor one of the giants of our revolutionary history and at the same time prepare the Library of

Congress more suitably to discharge its very important obligations to the Congress and the Nation.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support House Joint Resolution 642 and I am hopeful that the participation of the American Institute of Architects as provided in the bill, and explained in the committee report, will assure the Congress and the people of our country that the James Madison Memorial Building will be a structure of grace and beauty and will represent the highest standards of architecture, planning, and design of which our great architectural profession is capable.

In general, Government architecture over the years has not been distinguished for its excellence. In particular, a major recent addition to Capitol Hill has not received widespread praise for its scale, design, or esthetics.

All too frequently Federal architecture has been overwhelming in size and scale, dwarfing the individual citizen rather than dignifying him, and derived of a tasteless potpourri of drab, time-worn, architectural clichés devoid of genuine inspiration, style, or grace.

But recent developments in Government architecture have been heartening. The District of Columbia recently announced the retainer of one of the towering architects of this country, Mies van der Rohe, to design a great new public library for downtown Washington. And, according to today's press, the General Services Administration has created a design review panel of 17 American architects, among them many of the most distinguished members of the architectural profession, including Max Abramovitz, David L. Eggers, George E. Kassabaum, Vincet G. Kling, and Charles Luckman, in order to "reflect the expressed desire of President Johnson that the best possible contemporary thought and skills be applied to the Federal buildings," according to General Services Administrator Lawson B. Knott, Jr. The action was reported in the press to be in part a response to criticism that some buildings put up in years passed have lacked architectural distinction.

The James Madison Memorial Building provides an exciting opportunity to achieve an example of Federal architecture of such beauty, grace, and style as to be a source of pride to Members of Congress and the Nation. Surely a library which is a place of the intellect and the mind deserves a home which can fire the imagination, warm the heart, and send the spirit soaring.

It is my understanding, derived from members of the Public Works Committee, that the Architect of the Capitol will contract with an outstanding American architectural firm, of the caliber of excellence represented by the aforementioned architects, to plan and design the James Madison Memorial Building. The assurance of mere "consultation" with a committee designated by the American Institute of Architects would assure little or nothing in design excellence, absent full-fledged design authority, and responsibility in architects of proven excellence and accomplishment. Indeed, a perfunctory "consultation" could well be less than meaningless.

The bill also provides authorization for the Architect of the Capitol to do such landscaping as may be necessary. It is hoped that this broad authorization will include provision for artistic and esthetic amenities such as fountains, reflecting pools, sculpture, ceramic tile murals, paintings, and the like to enhance the beauty of the building.

The Housing and Home Finance Agency has established a policy of permitting housing developments insured under their programs to include expenditures of up to 1 percent of development costs for such artistic and esthetic amenities. Similarly, the General Services Administration is currently providing a budget of one-half of 1 percent for such purposes in the planning and design of new Federal buildings.

Nothing could be more consistent with our national goal of stimulating progress in the arts and humanities, and excellence in our national environment, than a new Federal building of great artistic and esthetic distinction on Capitol Hill.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule the Clerk will now report the committee substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. RES. 642

Joint resolution to authorize the Architect of the Capitol to construct the third Library of Congress building in square 732 in the District of Columbia to be named the James Madison Memorial Building and to contain a Madison Memorial Hall, and for other purposes

Whereas the Library of Congress has been critically in need of an additional building for several years and in 1958 submitted to the Joint Committee on the Library justification in support thereof, and the Architect of the Capitol, pursuant to statutory authorization set forth in Public Law 86-469, May 14, 1960, and the appropriation of funds by Public Law 86-628, July 12, 1960, and with the approval of the Joint Committee on the Library, undertook the preparation of preliminary plans and estimates of cost for an additional Library of Congress building of two million square feet, net area, to be constructed on four squares east of the Library Annex and to provide for the Library's growth for thirty-five years after 1960;

Whereas the James Madison Memorial Commission was established by Act of Congress of April 8, 1960, "for the purpose of considering and formulating plans for the design, construction, and location of a permanent memorial to James Madison in the city of Washington, District of Columbia, or its immediate environs", and pursuant to said Act, planned and recommended a Madison Memorial Research Library in square 732 which would have been limited to a Madison Memorial Hall and facilities for research by scholars and other experts with an underground annex consisting of three floors in which could be stored the papers of the twenty-three Presidents of the United States and other valuable documents now in the Library of Congress which would be made available for research in the memorial library;

Whereas the House Office Building Commission's jurisdiction over square 732, which is owned by the United States, and the said Commission's approval of the Madison Memorial Commission proposal for a Madison Memorial Research Library to be constructed on square 732 resulted in redirecting the

preparation of preliminary plans and estimates of cost for an additional Library of Congress building to include, as a part of the Library's building program, the proposed Madison Memorial Research Library and underground annex, both to be administered by the Librarian of Congress. Such redirection of the Library's building program as developed and reported to the Joint Committee on the Library in 1961 would have provided about 24 per centum of the Library's projected new space in the memorial and underground annex and the remaining 76 per centum on two squares east of the annex, in place of the initial plan for a single structure on four squares east of the annex;

Whereas the provision of an additional Library of Congress building is a dire necessity and should be undertaken without further delay and square 732, although limited to about 85 per centum of the space sought in an additional Library of Congress building, is a desirable location for such building, has been cleared of all structures, and would present no delay to building construction;

Whereas the construction of a third Library building in square 732 would render unnecessary at this time the acquisition and use of residential blocks east of the present Library Annex for a Library building; and

Whereas the designation of the Library of Congress third building as the Library of Congress James Madison Memorial Building and the inclusion of a Madison Memorial Hall would memorialize Madison in such a way as to bring to the attention of the American people and particularly students who come to Washington by the hundreds of thousands each year, the principles of government conceived by Madison which are embodied in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Architect of the Capitol under the direction jointly of the House Office Building Commission, the Senate Office Building Commission, and the Joint Committee on the Library, after consultation with a committee designated by the American Institute of Architects, is authorized and directed to construct (including, but not limited to, the preparation of all necessary designs, plans, and specifications) in square 732 in the District of Columbia a third Library of Congress fireproof building, which shall be known as the Library of Congress James Madison Memorial Building. The design of such building shall include a Madison Memorial Hall and shall be in keeping with the prevailing architecture of the Federal buildings on Capitol Hill. The Madison Memorial Hall shall be developed in consultation with the James Madison Memorial Commission.

(b) In carrying out his authority under this joint resolution, the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction jointly of the House Office Building Commission, the Senate Office Building Commission, and the Joint Committee on the Library, is authorized (1) to provide for such equipment, such connections with the Capitol Power Plant and other utilities, such access facilities over or under public streets, such changes in the present Library of Congress buildings, such changes in or additions to the present tunnels, and such other appurtenant facilities, as may be necessary, and (2) to do such landscaping as may be necessary by reason of the construction authorized by this joint resolution.

Sec. 2. The structural and mechanical care of the building authorized by this joint resolution and the care of the surrounding grounds shall be under the Architect of the Capitol.

Sec. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$75,000,000 to construct the building authorized by this

joint resolution (including the preparation of all necessary designs, plans, and specifications).

Mr. GRAY (interrupting reading of joint resolution). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF VIRGINIA

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: On page 7, line 4, insert:

"There is also authorized to be appropriated not exceeding \$10,000 to pay the expenses of the James Madison Memorial Commission."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, when the original Madison Memorial Commission was created there was an appropriation of \$10,000. Clerical help had to be employed and many of the Commissioners being away from the city, traveling expenses had to be provided. That fund has long since been exhausted. We were fortunate in having an affluent member of the Commission who has been taking care of the incidental expenses up to this time. In order to perfect these plans, which by the way are well along, we have preliminary sketches and so on—the Commission will need a small amount of money to continue their work to take care of expenses of travel and so forth for the members of the Commission.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

As the gentleman from Virginia has ably pointed out, the members of the James Madison Memorial Commission in many instances have dug into their own pockets to pay the expenses necessary to do the Commission's work. The resolution does provide that the Architect of the Capitol will be in consultation in direction of the James Madison Memorial Commission and the Senate and House Office Building Commissions, and this select committee of the National Institute of Architects.

I think it is unfair that we give them further responsibilities without providing adequate funds and since this is such a small amount of \$10,000 I hope the committee can agree to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as far as the majority side is concerned, we accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, we on the minority side join in accepting the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KUNKEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMER. As I understand, this is merely an authorization and the Committee on Appropriations will review past expenditures and have the right to consider it and to adopt it or to refuse it.

Mr. KUNKEL. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CLEVELAND

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLEVELAND: On page 6, after line 20, insert the following new subsection:

"(c) The Architect of the Capitol is authorized and directed to conduct a study with a view to determining the feasibility of including in the third Library of Congress building appropriate space for a visitors' center, which visitors' center would include, but not be limited to, facilities for dining, and general rest and relaxation. The inclusion of a visitors' center should not impair in any way the primary functions of the third Library of Congress building. The determinations of such study are to be made in consultation with the committee designated by the American Institute of Architects, in accordance with subsection (a) of this section, and the determination of the study are to be presented, jointly, to the House Office Building Commission, the Senate Office Building Commission, and the Joint Committee on the Library."

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is clear on its face. It would not add anything to the cost of the building nor would it be permitted to impair in any way the primary function of this building which is that of a library building, a useful and needed adjunct here on Capitol Hill.

However, it occurred to me, particularly after reading the current issue of Roll Call for September 30, that the suggestion I believe first offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WYDLER], that there is a desperate need here on the Hill for a place where visitors, our constituent visitors, can go for a light lunch or to rest their weary feet other than to our very crowded congressional offices, and that such a place is long overdue and badly needed.

It seems to me appropriate at this time, when our congressional sessions are getting longer and longer and there are more and more visitors, that, if in this new building, which will be adjacent to the House Office Buildings, space can be provided at no additional cost and without impairing the primary function of this building, the very essence of courtesy to do it. There is no place here on the Hill for these visitors to eat unless they are accompanied by their Congressman. There is no place they can even get a light lunch or a meal. Certainly our regard for our constituents would suggest that we at least pay them the courtesy of exploring the possibility of having such a visitors' center built and to see whether it is feasible or not.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVELAND. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to say I agree wholeheartedly with

the gentleman as to the need for the type of center that the gentleman is talking about. I believe we have that kind of requirement and it should be met at some time in the future, but I personally believe it should be located here in the Capitol itself and not off in a part of the Library of Congress. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVELAND. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Of course, there is a lot of merit in the idea that the gentleman is trying to put across here, and the idea has been around for some time. I would like to suggest to the gentleman, however, there is I think at the present time a study being made with respect to the establishment of a visitors' center in this area of the city. Various places have been suggested. But the building we are considering now in this joint resolution and the space in this proposed building is needed for library purposes. While I go along with the gentleman, I think we should hold off on this matter of a visitors' center until the overall matter of a visitors' center in Washington, particularly here in this area of Washington, is agreed upon or disposed of one way or another by those who are interested in this subject.

I certainly sympathize with what the gentleman is trying to do. I do not believe that we should put such a provision in the pending bill.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVELAND. If the gentleman would be good enough to use his own time, I would appreciate it, for I should like to answer the statement of the distinguished majority leader.

I believe the wording of my proposal is such that it would do nothing more than to encourage and to reactivate the studies which are now going on, and perhaps give to this problem of how we treat our visitors, a needed lift.

As Members who have read Roll Call know, the suggestion of Mr. WYDLER was for a building. I do not know whether we can afford or need a building. It might be that for several years, while the Library of Congress moves into the new space provided, suitable space could be provided for visitors there, and as that space became needed for library purposes, we could fall back on another building or other available space.

The fact is that now we are not cordial, courteous, or kind in this regard to our constituent visitors to Congress. Particularly for those junior Members of Congress who are still cooped up into two small offices in either one of the older House Office Buildings, it is extremely difficult to welcome one's constituents as graciously and as nicely as we would like to welcome them.

I believe that the proposal might be an interim solution. If there is not any way it can be done easily in the proposed new building, we shall not have lost a thing except for the fact that the Architect will have been called upon to study the question. There is nothing manda-

tory in the resolution. It is completely permissive. It is in the nature of a suggestion at the present time.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I should like to ask the gentleman from New Hampshire a question. He did not have time enough to yield. It seems that everyone is pretty well agreed that such a study should be made. Frankly, I have been very embarrassed time and time again when my constituents have come to the Capitol and have said, "Where can we park our automobile?" First, there is no parking space available. Second, they say, "I would like to be here at lunch time. Where can I eat? Where are there facilities for the visiting public on Capitol Hill to eat?"

Unless I go with them, or one of my staff members, to the House Restaurant, there is no place either in the Rayburn Building or in the Capitol itself where they can eat. I think it is a shame that the situation is such that a visitor can go to the Smithsonian Institute and eat in one of the finest cafeterias there is in the country, a cafeteria which is available to the visiting public. But if the visitor comes to Capitol Hill, he is denied such facilities—unless a Member or his staff is available to shepherd the visitor around, and we do our best to do so. But it has got now to the point that since there are thousands and thousands of visitors who come to Capitol Hill, the Members are not capable of handling them—at least, this Member. It seems to me that if we are going to consider this subject, it should be done through direction of the Congress and not through some informal group that, I understand from the majority leader, may be considering it. It should be done through the direction of the Congress. A proper study should be made and a proper presentation.

Would the gentleman object to the suggestion that instead of tying the proposal down to the new library building, that such a study might relate also to some other appropriate location in this vicinity of the Capitol? Would he agree to amend his amendment accordingly, so that any study taking place would consider all prospective, possible, and feasible locations on Capitol Hill? I do not believe that anyone in this body can suggest or explain to their visitors as to why they cannot find a place to park an automobile or get a bite to eat for lunch, particularly now that we forced away most of the restaurants that used to be in the near vicinity of the Hill.

Will the gentleman first comment on my suggested amendment to his amendment?

Mr. CLEVELAND. I think the gentleman from Florida has perhaps placed his finger on one objection to my amendment. That point has already been touched upon by the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT]. Perhaps it should not be too closely locked into the proposed building. I would accept the gentleman's amendment, if he will so move to have the amendment thus amended. I will accept the amendment.

Mr. CRAMER. I have an amendment prepared.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. I just wondered if the gentleman from Florida could tell me if we build the proposed building—and I believe we should because I realize that the space in the present library buildings is limited—would the building also be subject to taxation if the Congress at some time in the future grants home rule to the District of Columbia?

Mr. CRAMER. As I understand, it would depend on which bill would be enacted. If the Senate bill were enacted, the building would automatically be subject to a determination of value by whatever formula the District city council or commission would wish to give it. If the House bill should be enacted; that is, the Sisk amendment, the charter commission could so provide in the charter proposal.

I assume they will. If the city council or commission is finally adopted, it will have the power to determine the assessed value of any buildings, including this new one and including the Rayburn Building. I doubt if they will give an exemption to any Federal Government property, because that is the whole issue, whether the Federal Government property should be taxed directly or indirectly in order to help pay the expenses of running Washington, D.C.

Mr. HALEY. As I say, I would like to see this building constructed, because I believe it is needed. I certainly would like to have somebody tell me whether we are going to build a \$75 or \$100 million building here for some of these "eggheads" downtown to come in and tax the people generally, all over the United States, for.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I realize that Members want to get away today, and I shall try to be brief. I hope the committee will reject the amendment.

First, I congratulate the gentleman. I believe his idea is good. It is sound. It is something Congress should look into. But the gentleman's amendment calls for this study to be conducted by the Architect of the Capitol.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAY. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Is the gentleman speaking against my amendments, as amended?

Mr. GRAY. I am speaking against the amendment as it would be amended by the gentleman from Florida, [Mr. CRAMER]. Both the amendment and the amendment to the amendment call for the Architect of the Capitol to study whether or not we need a center for visitors. This is a prerogative of the Congress. This is something we should determine, not the Architect of the Capitol.

Furthermore, the amendment should not be in this bill for the simple reason that the third Library of Congress Building is no place for a visitors' center. It

will bound on Independence Avenue and C Street. I would ask the gentleman where in the world could be parked millions of automobiles which come here yearly to visit the Nation's Capital, when there is just a narrow street on Independence Avenue and a narrow street on C Street?

We know now it is not feasible to put a visitors' center in this building, because there is no place to accommodate the large influx of automobiles and tourists that would come to use the center.

Again, I say I believe the idea is good. If the gentleman will introduce legislation, and if it is brought before our committee, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Buildings and Grounds, I will certainly call a hearing on the matter, because it is something which all of us would like to look into and try to provide an answer to.

This certainly has no place in the pending joint resolution.

I urge that the committee reject both the amendment from the gentleman from New Hampshire and the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I should like to be associated with the very sensible remarks of the gentleman from Illinois. It is totally inconsistent with the purposes of a Library building, where we hope to have some kind of scholarly atmosphere and some kind of quiet study atmosphere, to have a center for tourists to go in and out to get tourist information.

I believe it is a fact, as has been noted in the press, that the committee established by the Congress to consider improvements in the organization of the Congress—a committee on which our distinguished colleague [Mr. MADDEN] serves as cochairman—is considering this proposition at this time. This is getting consideration by a congressional committee at this time, in addition to the consideration which will be given to the bill which has been introduced, commented upon a moment ago, by our colleague from New York [Mr. WYDLER].

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. If I understand the gentleman correctly, if the amendment is defeated he will give a hearing to a bill similar to the one the gentleman from New York [Mr. WYDLER] has introduced, so that we may have a visitors' area as well as the necessary parking space to serve the Capitol?

Mr. GRAY. I have not read the bill introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WYDLER]. If a bill is reported to our Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds, I certainly will give it immediate attention.

Further, I point out that any bill should direct the Congress to study this matter and not the Architect of the Capitol, because this is a matter which concerns all of our constituents and con-

cerns us individually. Although I have respect for the Architect, I believe this matter should rest with the Congress.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Buildings and Grounds, the gentleman is in agreement that there is a need?

Mr. GRAY. I compliment the gentleman from New Hampshire for bringing up this matter, although I do not believe it belongs in this joint resolution.

I urge the defeat of the amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CRAMER

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMER to the amendment offered by Mr. CLEVELAND: On lines 3 and 4, strike the words "appropriate space for" and insert in lieu thereof "or providing at any other appropriate location in the vicinity of the Capitol".

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment will read as follows, with the amendment I have offered, which the gentleman from New Hampshire indicates he is willing to accept:

The Architect of the Capital is authorized and directed to conduct a study with a view to determining the feasibility of including in the third Library of Congress Building or providing at any other appropriate location in the vicinity of the Capitol a visitors' center.

And so forth. I think it has been admitted that such a study is needed and such a study should take place. This would simply authorize the study with the official stamp of approval of the Congress. This is merely a study, and any study by the Architect of the Capitol is subject to review by the House Office Building Commission and by the proper committee of Congress, meaning the Committee on Public Works, following the submission of the report. If the Members of the House want to go on record as opposing, the right of the tax-paying public to have needed facilities including washrooms in particular and to have a study made to determine where they should be on Capitol Hill, then let them vote against the amendment. If they acknowledge that it is a serious problem which should be met and solved and that we should get at that job now, then they will vote for this amendment and the amendment to the amendment which I just offered.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida to the amendment of the gentleman from New Hampshire. I will concede that it does improve the amendment that was originally advanced to the House here today, but I would like to submit that it is a little surprising to see the gentleman from Florida, who very, very often objects to matters that are brought to the floor of this House by the committee on the grounds that they have not had careful and extensive consideration by a committee—it is a little surprising and startling and out of character to hear him propose that we should embark on something as extensive as this by action on the floor rather than taking the action by the committee after

careful hearings at the committee level.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding, but when I suggested this amendment of mine for study to my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], he informed me that the matter of the lack of courtesy services available to constituents on Capitol Hill was so well known to him that he assumed it was just as well known to all of the Members of this body and therefore it did not need great study, because we all know that the problem exists and all we need is a study to see where on the Hill the facilities could be provided for them.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am glad to get that insight into the thought processes of the gentleman from Florida, but it still does not answer the point that he is normally very insistent on careful committee consideration of any proposal that is advanced before it is acted on on the floor of the House.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I will say the question is not the need. All of us agree that there is a need for a visitors center. The question is where is the most practical place to put this center. I object to the amendment because it calls for the Architect of the Capitol to determine the best location. I think our committee should be the one to hear witnesses and to study this matter. Therefore, I hope that the amendment is rejected because we should have the prerogative and not the Architect of the Capitol.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman, of course, did not read the whole amendment, because if he did, he would see that the Architect has to report back to the House Office Building Commission and the Senate Office Building Commission and the Joint Committee on the Library as to his study. I will say to the gentleman that the most influential and convincing remarks made on this proposal, which really sold me on it, were made by his own colleague from Oklahoma, the distinguished majority leader, who indicated that he felt, too, that such a study was needed and one was informally underway. I say if it is informally underway, let us formalize it, and this is the way to do it.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, of course, there is a committee of the House and a committee of the Senate inquiring into this matter at this time. The distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma is chairman of that committee. Our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] is co-chairman of that committee. It seems to me it would certainly be pulling a section of rug out from under that committee if now we started the Architect

of the Capitol off on an independent study under this ill considered amendment. I hope it will be defeated.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment as amended.

Mr. Chairman, as the author of the bill which has been submitted on this subject of a congressional visitors' center and which is now under consideration by the committee, I rise in support of this amendment for one very simple reason. Everybody who has spoken today has said they are in favor of this visitors' center. Why not start consideration of it at the earliest possible date? The sooner the better, I say, although I am delighted to hear the majority leader and committee chairman favoring my proposal and promise action on it. We have the vehicle to do it this morning, and it is the Cleveland-Cramer amendment to the bill. I cannot see any reason why we should be delaying it and I do not see that delay does any good for anybody. Certainly the final decision will rest with the Members of Congress and the committee involved, because whatever the Architect of the Capitol determines or proposes will come back to the Congress for final approval. All we are doing by putting it off is stalling the final decision. I do not think that is the proper procedure for Congress to follow in this matter.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. WYDLER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GRAY. First let me say we have no intention of stalling this matter. It was first brought to my attention as chairman of the subcommittee 15 minutes ago. I have assured the gentleman from New Hampshire who offered the original amendment, and I assure you, that our committee will give this matter consideration.

But, I again reiterate, that I do not want a study conducted by the Architect of the Capitol, since this is our prerogative. We have the Capital Planning Commission, and a lot of other agencies that should be consulted.

The Architect of the Capitol does not have the facilities to call all of these people in. Our committee does have such facilities and we are willing to do this.

I assure the gentleman from New York that there will be no delay in bringing this matter up, if the gentleman will introduce a bill.

Mr. WYDLER. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois, what would be wrong with having the Architect of the Capitol start studying it now? What harm would there be in that?

Mr. GRAY. The gentleman knows, if he will yield further, that the Architect of the Capitol—and I am not singling him out as an individual, but no individual—the Clerk of the House, the Architect or anyone else—should be permitted to study a matter that is of such vital concern to the gentleman's constituents, to my constituents, and to the constituents of every Member of this Congress.

A visitors' center is an important matter, as pointed out by our distinguished majority leader. We are willing to con-

sider the matter, but we do not want to have to abide by a report made by the Architect of the Capitol, since he does not have the sole jurisdiction in the matter.

Mr. WYDLER. I understand the gentleman, but I do not understand why his committee would be bound by the reports of the Architect of the Capitol. It would be something that would give you some basis on which to proceed.

However, I would like to direct my remarks for just a minute to the remarks of the gentleman from Oklahoma, when he said and made the point that we should not put a visitor center in the Library of Congress, because it would be inappropriate.

I have received a letter from the American Political Science Association backing up my proposal for a visitors' center on the educational grounds that it can perform a service to the country. I do not believe it is consistent at all with the purposes of this legislation.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYDLER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Does the letter from the American Political Science Association say they believe that it should be located in the Library of Congress?

Mr. WYDLER. No, they say they support the proposal, but the proposal they made would be very much in harmony if it were in the Library of Congress, because they talk about its use for lecture halls and for the purpose of holding meetings and conferences for people around the country. In any case, the location is a detail to be decided later. Let us start a consideration of the proposal at the earliest possible date.

I believe it is very harmonious with the purposes envisioned in this bill.

Finally, I would like to say this: Why should we delay? This is the important thing. I feel that our constituents deserve such a center. I am sure that every Member here has invited his constituents to come down to the Capitol and visit them. All of us do that. Let us treat them right when they get here. Let us adopt the amendment and get on with the job.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] to the amendment of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CRAMER) there were—ayes 20, noes 83.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CLEVELAND), there were—ayes 21, noes 84.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time simply to inform my colleagues that when the Committee rises and we go back to the

full House, I will offer a motion to recommit with instructions to have the Cleveland amendment with the Cramer amendment to the Cleveland amendment added to this legislation. This will give us all an opportunity to vote on the record on the matter that we have already debated and discussed here.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee substitute amendment, as amended.

The committee substitute amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WELTNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 642) to authorize the Architect of the Capitol to construct the third Library of Congress building in Square 732 in the District of Columbia to be named the James Madison Memorial Building and to contain a Madison Memorial Hall, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 458, he reported the joint resolution back to the House with an amendment adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. CLEVELAND. I am in its present form, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CLEVELAND moves to recommit the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 642, to the Committee on Public Works with instructions to report the same forthwith with the following amendment: On page 6, after line 20, insert the following new subsection:

"(c) The Architect of the Capitol is authorized and directed to conduct a study with a view to determining the feasibility of including in the third Library of Congress building, or providing at any other appropriate location in the vicinity of the Capitol, a visitors' center, which visitors' center would include, but not be limited to, facilities for dining, and general rest and relaxation. The inclusion of a visitors' center should not impair in any way the primary functions of the third Library of Congress building. The determinations of such study are to be made in consultation with the committee designated by the American Institute of Architects, in accordance with subsection (a) of this section, and the determinations of the study are to be presented, jointly, to the House Office Building Commission, the Senate Office Building Commission, and the Joint Committee on the Library."

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CLEVELAND), there were—ayes 21, noes 102.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 17, nays 321, answered "present" 1, not voting 93, as follows:

[Roll No. 345]

YEAS—17

Andrews,
N. Dak.
Brock
Broomfield
Broyhill, N.C.
Cleveland

Cramer
Curtin
Griffin
Grover
Hall
Halpern

Jonas
Kunkel
McDade
Mailliard
Pelly
Wydler

NAYS—321

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adams
Albert
Anderson,
Tenn.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Ayres
Baldwin
Bandstra
Baring
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bow
Brademas
Brooms
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Callan
Cameron
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clancy
Clark
Clausen,
Don H.
Clawson, Del.
Clevenger
Cohelan
Collier
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Craley
Culver
Cunningham
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.

de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Diggs
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fisher
Flood
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford,
William D.
Fountain
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Gialmo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Gray
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffiths
Gross
Gubser
Gurney
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hamilton
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Harris
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.

Hathaway
Hawkins
Hechler
Helstoski
Herlong
Hicks
Holland
Horton
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keith
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Krebs
Landrum
Langen
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Love
McCarthy
McClary
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
McVicker
MacGregor
Machen
Mackay
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
Meeds
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morrison

Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Quile
Quillen
Race
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Pa.
Roberts

Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Satterfield
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secret
Selden
Sennar
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Slask
Slask
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stanton
Stephens
Stubblefield

Sullivan
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Trimble
Tuck
Tunney
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Waggoner
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Wildnall
Willis
Wilson,
Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Young
Younger
Zablocki

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

O'Konski

NOT VOTING—93

Adair
Addabbo
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews,
George W.
Andrews,
Glenn
Aspinall
Bolton
Bonner
Bray
Burton, Utah
Cahill
Callaway
Carey
Carter
Celler
Colmer
Cooley
Curtis
Dawson
Dorn
Dow
Duncan, Oreg.
Dyal
Evins, Tenn.
Flynt
Frelinghuysen
Gilligan
Goodell
Grabowski
Green, Oreg.
Hagan, Ga.
Halleck
Hanley
Hansen, Iowa
Hardy
Harsha
Hays
Hébert
Henderson
Hollifield
Hosmer
Johnson, Okla.
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
Kornegay
Laird
Latta
Lindsay
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McCulloch
Macdonald
Mackie
Martin, Ala.
Mathias
Matthews
May
Michel
Mize
Morris
Morse
Nix
Olsen, Mont.
Powell
Purcell
Redlin
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Robison
Roncalio
Roudebush
Scott
Shipley
Smith, Iowa
Steed
Stratton
Sweeney
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Tupper
Utt
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wyatt
Yates

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. O'Konski for, with Mr. Halleck against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Bob Wilson.

Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Hosmer.

Mr. Morris with Mr. Goodell.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.

Mr. Dow with Mr. Martin of Alabama.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Robison.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Toll with Mr. Harsha.

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Glenn Andrews.

Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Curtis.

Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Morse.
 Mr. Sweeney with Mrs. Bolton.
 Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Cahill.
 Mr. Williams with Mr. Callaway.
 Mr. Cooley with Mr. Carter.
 Mr. Hays with Mr. Tupper.
 Mr. Evins with Mr. Utt.
 Mr. Carey with Mr. Wyatt.
 Mr. Purcell with Mr. Burton of Utah.
 Mr. Shipley with Mr. Adair.
 Mr. Thomas with Mr. Laird.
 Mr. Redlin with Mr. McCulloch.
 Mr. Aspinall with Mrs. May.
 Mr. Stratton with Mr. Bray.
 Mr. George W. Andrews with Mr. Rouben-
 bush
 Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Michel.
 Mr. Dyal with Mr. Mize.
 Mr. Hanley with Mr. Latta.
 Mr. Gilligan with Mr. Mathias.
 Mr. Hardy with Mr. Lindsay.
 Mr. Yates with Mr. Nix.
 Mr. Olson of Montana with Mr. Powell.
 Mr. Resnick with Mr. Grabowski.
 Mr. Reuss with Mr. Dawson.
 Mr. Steed with Mr. Bonner.
 Mr. Kee with Mr. Duncan of Oregon.
 Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Smith of Iowa.
 Mr. Scott with Mr. Roncallo.
 Mr. Kornegay with Mr. Matthews.
 Mr. Mackie with Mrs. Green of Oregon.
 Mr. Dorn with Mr. Hansen of Iowa.
 Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Long of
 Maryland.
 Mr. Flynt with Mr. Henderson.

Messrs. GROSS and OLSON of Minne-
 sota changed their votes from "yea" to
 "nay."

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have
 a live pair with the gentleman from In-
 diana [Mr. HALLECK]. If he were pres-
 ent he would have voted "nay." I voted
 "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote
 "present."

The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on
 the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the
 Speaker announced that the "ayes" ap-
 peared to have it.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I object to
 the vote on the ground that a quorum
 is not present and make the point of
 order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum
 is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors,
 the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent
 Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there
 were—yeas 328, nays 5, answered "pres-
 ent" 1, not voting 98, as follows:

[Roll No. 346]

YEAS—328

Abbott	Bingham	Chamberlain
Abernethy	Blatnik	Chelf
Adams	Boggs	Clancy
Albert	Boland	Clark
Anderson,	Bolling	Clausen,
Tenn.	Bow	Don H.
Andrews,	Brademas	Clawson, Del
N. Dak.	Brook	Clevenger
Annunzio	Brooks	Cohelan
Arends	Broomfield	Collier
Ashbrook	Brown, Calif.	Conable
Ashmore	Broyhill, N.C.	Conte
Ayres	Broyhill, Va.	Conyers
Bandstra	Burke	Corbett
Baring	Burleson	Corman
Barrett	Burton, Calif.	Craley
Bates	Byrne, Pa.	Cramer
Battin	Byrnes, Wis.	Culver
Beckworth	Cabell	Cunningham
Belcher	Callan	Curtin
Bell	Cameron	Daddario
Bennett	Casey	Dague
Berry	Cederberg	Daniels
Betts		Davis, Ga.

Davis, Wis.	Jacobs	Quillen
de la Garza	Jarman	Race
Delaney	Jennings	Randall
Dent	Joelson	Reid, Ill.
Denton	Johnson, Calif.	Reid, N.Y.
Derwinski	Johnson, Pa.	Reifel
Devine	Jones, Ala.	Reinecke
Dickinson	Jones, Mo.	Resnick
Diggs	Karsten	Rhodes, Pa.
Dingell	Karth	Roberts
Dole	Kastenmeier	Rodino
Donohue	Keith	Rogers, Colo.
Dowdy	King, Calif.	Rogers, Fla.
Downing	King, N.Y.	Rogers, Tex.
Dulski	King, Utah	Ronan
Duncan, Tenn.	Kirwan	Rooney, N.Y.
Dwyer	Krebs	Rooney, Pa.
Edmondson	Kunkel	Rosenthal
Edwards, Ala.	Landrum	Rostenkowski
Edwards, Calif.	Langen	Roush
Ellsworth	Leggett	Roybal
Erlenborn	Lennon	Rumsfeld
Evans, Colo.	Long, Md.	Ryan
Everett	Love	Satterfield
Fallon	McClary	St Germain
Farbstein	McDade	St. Onge
Farnsley	McDowell	Saylor
Farnum	McEwen	Scheuer
Feighan	McFall	Schisler
Findley	McGrath	Schmidhauser
Fisher	McMillan	Schneebeli
Flood	McVicker	Schweiker
Fogarty	MacGregor	Secrest
Foley	Machen	Seiden
Ford, Gerald R.	Mackay	Shriver
Ford,	Madden	Sickles
William D.	Mahon	Sikes
Fountain	Marsh	Sisk
Fraser	Martin, Mass.	Skubitz
Friedel	Martin, Nebr.	Slack
Fulton, Pa.	Mathias	Smith, Va.
Fulton, Tenn.	Matsunaga	Springer
Fuqua	Meeds	Stafford
Gallagher	Miller	Staggers
Garmatz	Mills	Stalbaum
Gathings	Minish	Stanton
Gettys	Mink	Stephens
Gialmo	Minshall	Stubblefield
Gibbons	Moeller	Sullivan
Gilbert	Monagan	Talcott
Gonzalez	Moore	Taylor
Gray	Moorhead	Teague, Tex.
Green, Pa.	Morgan	Tenzer
Greigg	Morrison	Thomson, Wis.
Grider	Morton	Trimble
Griffin	Mosher	Tuck
Griffiths	Moss	Tunney
Gross	Multer	Tuten
Grover	Murphy, Ill.	Udall
Gubser	Murphy, N.Y.	Ullman
Gurney	Murray	Van Deerlin
Hagen, Calif.	Natcher	Vanik
Haley	Nedzi	Vigorito
Hall	Nelsen	Vivian
Halpern	O'Brien	Waggonner
Hamilton	O'Hara, Ill.	Walker, Miss.
Hanna	O'Hara, Mich.	Walker, N. Mex.
Hansen, Idaho	Olsen, Mont.	Watkins
Hansen, Wash.	Olson, Minn.	Watson
Harris	O'Neal, Ga.	Watts
Harvey, Ind.	O'Neill, Mass.	Weitner
Harvey, Mich.	Ottinger	Whalley
Hathaway	Passman	White, Idaho
Hawkins	Patman	White, Tex.
Hechler	Patten	Whitener
Helstoski	Pepper	Whitten
Herlong	Perkins	Widnall
Hicks	Philbin	Williams
Holland	Pickle	Willis
Horton	Pike	Wilson,
Howard	Pirnie	Charles H.
Hull	Poage	Wolff
Hungate	Poff	Wright
Huot	Pool	Wyder
Hutchinson	Price	Young
Ichord	Pucinski	Younger
Irwin	Quile	Zablocki

NAYS—5

Baldwin McCarthy Smith, N.Y.
 Jonas O'Konski

ANSWERED "PRESENT"

Cleveland

NOT VOTING—98

Adair	Bonner	Curtis
Addabbo	Bray	Dawson
Anderson, Ill.	Burton, Utah	Dorn
Andrews,	Cahill	Dow
George W.	Callaway	Duncan, Ore.
Andrews,	Carey	Dyal
Glenn	Carter	Evins, Tenn.
Ashley	Celler	Fascell
Aspinall	Colmer	Fino
Bolton	Cooley	Flynt

Frelinghuysen	Latta	Rivers, S.C.
Gilligan	Lindsay	Robison
Goodell	Lipscomb	Roncallo
Grabowski	Long, La.	Roubenush
Green, Ore.	McCulloch	Scott
Hagan, Ga.	Macdonald	Senner
Halleck	Mackie	Shipley
Hanley	Mailliard	Smith, Calif.
Hansen, Iowa	Martin, Ala.	Smith, Iowa
Hardy	Matthews	Steed
Harsha	May	Stratton
Hays	Mize	Sweeney
Hébert	Michel	Teague, Calif.
Henderson	Morris	Thomas
Hollifield	Morse	Thompson, N.J.
Hosmer	Nix	Thompson, Tex.
Johnson, Okla.	Pelly	Todd
Kee	Powell	Toll
Kelly	Purcell	Tupper
Keogh	Redlin	Utt
Kluczynski	Reuss	Wilson, Bob
Kornegay	Rhodes, Ariz.	Wyatt
Laird	Rivers, Alaska	Yates

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following
 pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Glenn Andrews for, with Mr. Cleveland
 against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Halleck.
 Mr. Hébert with Mr. Cahill.
 Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Bob Wilson.
 Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Laird.
 Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Fino.
 Mr. Dow with Mr. Adair.
 Mr. Gilligan with Mrs. Bolton.
 Mr. Purcell with Mr. Wyatt.
 Mr. Henderson with Mr. Utt.
 Mr. Redlin with Mr. Roubenush.
 Mr. Celler with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.
 Mr. Kornegay with Mr. Teague of Califor-
 nia.

Mr. Toll with Mr. Bray.
 Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Tupper.
 Mr. Dyal with Mr. Morse.
 Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
 Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Goodell.
 Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Latta.
 Mr. Hanley with Mr. Mailliard.
 Mr. Hardy with Mrs. May.
 Mr. Stratton with Mr. Lipscomb.
 Mr. George W. Andrews with Mr. Carter.
 Mr. Sweeney with Mr. Michel.
 Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Hosmer.
 Mr. Morris with Mr. Curtis.
 Mr. Macdonald with Mr. McCulloch.
 Mr. Colmer with Mr. Callaway.
 Mr. Carey with Mr. Smith of California.
 Mr. Hays with Mr. Pelly.
 Mr. Kee with Mr. Robison.
 Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Harsha.
 Mr. Reuss with Mr. Mize.
 Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Mar-
 tin of Alabama.
 Mr. Powell with Mr. Lindsay.
 Mr. Hansen of Iowa with Mr. Anderson of
 Illinois.
 Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Burton of
 Utah.
 Mr. Shipley with Mr. Roncallo.
 Mr. Senner with Mr. Mackie.
 Mr. Matthews with Mr. Fascell.
 Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Grabowski.
 Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Nix.
 Mr. Thomas with Mr. Olsen of Montana.
 Mr. Scott with Mr. Cooley.
 Mr. Dorn with Mr. Bonner.
 Mr. Ashley with Mr. Dawson.
 Mr. Steed with Mr. Flynt.

Mr. BELL changed his vote from
 "nay" to "yea."

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I
 have a live pair with the gentleman
 from Alabama [Mr. GLENN ANDREWS].
 If he were present he would vote "yea."
 I voted "nay." Therefore, I withdraw
 my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 69) to authorize the Administrator of General Services to construct the third Library of Congress building in square 732 in the District of Columbia, to be named the "Library of Congress James Madison Memorial Building" and to contain a Madison Memorial Hall, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The CLERK. Amendment offered by Mr. GRAY is to strike out all after the resolving clause of Senate Joint Resolution 69 and insert the provisions of House Joint Resolution 642, as passed, as follows:

That (a) the Architect of the Capitol under the direction jointly of the House Office Building Commission, the Senate Office Building Commission, and the Joint Committee on the Library, after consultation with a committee designated by the American Institute of Architects, is authorized and directed to construct (including, but not limited to, the preparation of all necessary designs, plans, and specifications) in square 732 in the District of Columbia a third Library of Congress fireproof building, which shall be known as the Library of Congress James Madison Memorial Building. The design of such building shall include a Madison Memorial Hall and shall be in keeping with the prevailing architecture of the Federal buildings on Capitol Hill. The Madison Memorial Hall shall be developed in consultation with the James Madison Memorial Commission.

(b) In carrying out his authority under this joint resolution, the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction jointly of the House Office Building Commission, the Senate Office Building Commission, and the Joint Committee on the Library, is authorized (1) to provide for such equipment, such connections with the Capitol Power Plant and other utilities, such access facilities over or under public streets, such changes in the present Library of Congress buildings, such changes in or additions to the present tunnels, and such other appurtenant facilities, as may be necessary, and (2) to do such landscaping as may be necessary by reason of the construction authorized by this joint resolution.

Sec. 2. The structural and mechanical care of the building authorized by this joint resolution and the care of the surrounding grounds shall be under the Architect of the Capitol.

Sec. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$75,000,000 to construct the building authorized by this joint resolution (including the preparation of all necessary designs, plans, and specifications).

There is also authorized to be appropriated not exceeding \$10,000 to pay the expenses of the James Madison Memorial Commission.

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint Resolution to authorize the Architect of the Capitol to construct the third Library of Congress building in square 732 in the District of Columbia to be named the James Madison Memorial Building and to contain a Madison Memorial Hall, and for other purposes."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An Act to authorize the Architect of the Capitol to construct the third Library of Congress building in square 732 in the District of Columbia to be named the James Madison Memorial Building and to contain a Madison Memorial Hall, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House joint resolution (H.J. Res. 642) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the joint resolution just passed, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House have until midnight tonight to file a conference report to accompany H.R. 9042.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries have until midnight tonight to file a report on S. 2118.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 342 which was a motion to recommit H.R. 10281, and on rollcall No. 343, which was a motion on final passage of the same bill, I was unavoidably detained in committee.

I would like to announce that had I been present I would have voted "aye" on both votes.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1966

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 10871) making appropriations for Foreign Assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so for the reason of notifying the Members that it is our intention at the proper time to make a motion to recommit the conference report back to the conference committee.

Mr. Speaker, Members will probably remember that we had in the bill as the appropriation bill on foreign aid passed this body a short time ago, very strong language relative to shipping to North Vietnam. This language has been changed by the conference committee in connection with the language that the House put in the bill as it passed this body known as the "Rooney of New York amendment."

It is our intention at the proper time to offer a motion to recommit based upon this change.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1103)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10871) "making appropriations for Foreign Assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, 6, and 8.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 7, and 12; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$618,225,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 9, 10, and 11.

OTTO E. PASSMAN (except as to amendments 7 and 9),
JOHN J. ROONEY,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
JULIA BUTLER HANSEN,
JEFFERY COHELAN,
CLARENCE D. LONG,
GEORGE MAHON,
GARNER E. SHRIVER (except as to amendments 7 and 9),

SILVIO O. CONTE (except as to amendments 7 and 9),

MARK ANDREWS (except as to amendments 7 and 9),

FRANK T. BOW (except as to amendments 7 and 9),

Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN O. PASTORE,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10871) making appropriations for Foreign Assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—FOREIGN ASSISTANCE

Economic assistance

Amendment No. 1—Technical cooperation and development grants: Appropriates \$202,355,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$182,355,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2—International organizations and programs: Appropriates \$144,755,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$134,755,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3—Supporting assistance: Appropriates \$369,200,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$349,200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4—Alliance for Progress, development loans: Appropriates \$435,125,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$445,125,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 5—Development loans: Appropriates \$618,225,000 instead of \$675,225,000 as proposed by the House and \$593,225,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6—Development loans: Restores House language which prohibits the transfer of development loan funds to the International Development Association, the World Bank, and the International Finance Corporation, instead of Senate language which would have permitted the transfer of not to exceed 10 per centum of such funds to such multilateral agencies.

Amendment No. 7—General Provisions: Deletes House language relating to North Vietnam.

Amendment No. 8—General Provisions: Restores House language relating to North Vietnam.

Amendment No. 9—General Provisions: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur with an amendment. The proposed amendment is as follows:

"Sec. 116. No assistance shall be furnished under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, to any country that sells, furnishes or permits any ships under its registry to carry to North Vietnam any of the items mentioned in subsection 107(a) of this Act unless the President determines that the withholding of such assistance would be contrary to the national interest of the United States and reports such determination to the Congress."

Amendment No. 10—General Provisions: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which inserts a new general provision—section 117—prohibiting assistance to the United Arab Republic unless the President determines that the availability of such assistance is essential to the national interest of the United States.

Amendment No. 11—General Provisions: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which inserts a new general provision—section 118—prohibiting assistance to Indonesia unless the President determines that the availability of such assistance is essential to the national interest of the United States.

TITLE II—FOREIGN ASSISTANCE (OTHER)

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Amendment No. 12—Assistance to Refugees in the United States: Appropriates \$30,000,-

000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$32,265,000 as proposed by the House.

OTTO E. PASSMAN (except as to amendments Nos. 7 and 9),

JOHN J. ROONEY,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
JULIA BUTLER HANSEN,
JEFFERY COHELAN,

CLARENCE D. LONG,
GEORGE MAHON,

GARNER E. SHRIVER (except as to amendments 7 and 9),

SILVIO O. CONTE (except as to amendments 7 and 9),

MARK ANDREWS (except as to amendments 7 and 9),

FRANK T. BOW (except as to amendments 7 and 9),

Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Boggs). The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will approve the conference report and I hope we can say something during our deliberations that will convince the Members that it is in the best interest of our country at this time that this conference report not be recommended.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks a table comprising the conference bill with the estimates and other related matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to assure you and my very able, sincere, and devoted chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and each one of his subcommittee chairmen, that when any bureaucrat from downtown comes to me with regard to a matter pertaining to legislation under the jurisdiction of the chairman of another subcommittee, I shall in the future, as I have in the past, ask him: "Have you discussed the matter with the chairman of the subcommittee that handles the legislation?"

May I say that arrogance knows no bounds, and if some of the bureaucrats in the AID—I am being charitable—intentionally ignore the chairman of a subcommittee handling legislation, they may eventually extend the same treatment to the chairman of the full committee, and maybe go up through the ranks to the top.

When I brought the foreign assistance appropriation bill to the floor of the House a few weeks ago, I stated that even though it was one of the fattest—if not the fattest—foreign aid bill ever presented to the Congress, when all segments from the 15 bills are put together, if I were to have the privilege of handling the bill, I would be honorbound to assume the responsibility of defending it. I meant what I said—and I said what I meant.

I shall not use any more time than necessary, but honor demands that I make restitution when it is proper so to do. So, let me correct the record on two important points:

The very able and distinguished gentleman from Michigan, the Honorable CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN, came to me several days before the foreign aid appropriations bill came to the floor of the House for consideration and stated that

he had worked out an important amendment which he intended to offer, with respect to our allies shipping strategic materials to North Vietnam. I commended him for his wisdom and patriotism in putting together such a clarifying and positive amendment.

Subsequently, another distinguished Member of this body, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], offered a similar amendment, which was adopted. Equal commendations are due both of these gentlemen, and honor prompts me to acknowledge on this floor the discussion I had with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN].

Mr. Speaker, I believe that my record of handling the foreign aid appropriation bill for many years would indicate that I know something about the legislation. Even though my personal views certainly differ from those of many of my colleagues, it has been my practice to lean over backward to be fair. Doubtless our distinguished Speaker is familiar with the fact that I will usually deliver more than I promise.

When we were discussing the foreign aid appropriation bill several weeks ago, I inadvertently made a statement that certainly needs an explanation, and there is no better time to correct the record than now. So may I set the record straight:

The distinguished, able, and dedicated Member from Kansas, the minority chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations, the Honorable GARNER E. SHRIVER, stated to me in advance of the markup of the bill that he would offer an amendment to reduce the bill substantially. But, the parliamentary procedure that we followed in marking up the bill just about skunked the chairman as well as the distinguished Member from Kansas. And, a majority of the members of the subcommittee reported the bill to the full committee, and it was later passed by the House as marked up by the subcommittee.

In the intervening time between the markup of the bill and action by the full committee, I called the distinguished Member from Kansas and asked him, as a very special favor to me, not to offer any amendments in the full committee to further reduce the recommendations made by the subcommittee.

Suffice it to say, he did not offer any amendments, but I later learned that the amendments he had in mind were subsequently offered by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] in his motion to recommit the bill. In opposing the amendments offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW], I stated that I had never heard his recommended figure before. That statement was true, but it was simply because of the fact that the gentleman from Kansas, who is charitable, Christian, and understanding, did not offer the amendment in the full committee. And, I must say, in my opinion, it was because I asked him not to.

With my apologies properly recorded, may I explain briefly the conference report?

Mr. Speaker, I have never believed in shadow-boxing. To indicate or imply in any way that under the provisions of the conference report before you that certain items in the bill meet the full

administration request, while others have been reduced, would be untrue. Because the administration will be handed only an appropriation bill and they can vacate all projects in a country and substitute a new set for a new country, as this program is completely on an illustrative basis.

In most accounts, they can transfer in and out to offset any reduction that we have made in other accounts. If you claim that supporting assistance is funded in fully—language-wise, yes—legally-wise, no. They can transfer out of the account into other accounts, and around we go.

May I also say that my efforts in behalf of the American taxpayer have always been to reduce the overall money request rather than just certain items because of the fact that the program justifications are submitted on an illustrative basis.

By the same token, I have, almost without exception, steered clear of policywriting amendments to the foreign operations subcommittee appropriation bill because of the obvious fact that the members of the Committee on Appropriations are not in possession of all the pertinent information possessed by the executive branch.

Mr. Speaker, most conferences, especially in the closing days of a long, hard session, must, of necessity, it would appear, be rush-up, rush-on types of conferences. Many times Members are not given an opportunity to study in detail modifications suggested by the executive branch.

On yesterday, in considering the modification of the amendment adopted unanimously by this body dealing with our allies shipping to North Vietnam, and subsequently changed by the other body, and later modified in the confer-

ence at executive branch request, the modified language went to another member of the subcommittee, and not to the chairman. However, in conference I reserved and did not vote for the modified, recommended executive branch amendment. Since then, I have had an opportunity to study in detail the modified language recommended by the executive branch to the conference and explained by another subcommittee member, not by myself, and I now find that for reasons we cannot discuss in detail on the floor without violating what is termed "secret" information, I hope the House will adopt the conference report. Keep in mind that we are dealing with a policy matter and, by precedent, a matter properly under the jurisdiction of the President.

Suffice to say, had the executive branch not waited until the last minute to suggest needed policy language changes between the versions of the two branches of the Congress, we would not be in this dilemma now. I promised them that I would give complete consideration to the recommendations of the executive branch.

But I was only contacted one time, and I never received a copy of their recommendation at that time. This is no indictment of the other able members of this committee.

I should mention that this is a much better bill than most Members would expect. The other branch of the Congress reduced the bill \$142 million.

The conference bill is almost a split between the two bills. It is \$67 million below the House bill and \$75 million above the Senate bill. It is the best compromise we could get.

I believe the House would like to be reminded again of the House limitation against section 205 of the authorization

bill, which would have permitted the executive branch to transfer funds out of the development credits appropriation, sometimes referred to as loans by the executive branch, into the International Development Association and other multilateral agencies. We have crossed that bridge before. This time, as in previous years, if I recall correctly, the committee—with one or two exceptions, I had better add—demanded that the language which would permit a transfer of not to exceed 15 percent of the development loan appropriation into the International Development Association be stricken from the bill. The other body agreed with our position.

I believe this is a good conference report so far as good conference reports go on the foreign aid appropriation bill, and I hope that in this instance, concerning our disagreement over North Vietnam, we will yield to the judgment of the Executive, because we are dealing with a policy matter. I am assured by the Executive that in the future each member of the conference committee will receive a copy of any recommended modifications. They have also assured me that it was not by design or purpose that a copy of their proposed language did not come to us long enough in advance so that we could study it in detail.

I want to say, at the expense of being repetitious, that there are good and sufficient reasons why this bill should not be recommitted. We are dealing with some matters that are "top secret" and we cannot reveal them on this floor, so I hope Members will follow the recommendations of a majority of the members of the conference and not recommit the bill.

The following data relate to the conference bill and other pertinent data relating to the foreign aid bill:

Foreign assistance and related agencies appropriation bill, 1966

TITLE I—FOREIGN ASSISTANCE

Item	1965 appropriations	1966 budget estimates	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—			
						1965 appropriation	1966 budget estimates	House	Senate
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT									
MUTUAL DEFENSE AND DEVELOPMENT									
ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE									
Technical cooperation and development grants.....	\$202,071,000	\$219,000,000	\$202,355,000	\$182,355,000	\$202,355,000	+\$284,000	—\$16,645,000	-----	+\$20,000,000
American schools and hospitals abroad.....	16,800,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	—9,800,000	-----	-----	-----
Surveys of investment opportunities.....	1,600,000	-----	-----	-----	-----	—1,600,000	-----	-----	-----
International organizations and programs.....	134,272,400	145,555,000	144,755,000	134,755,000	144,755,000	+10,482,600	—800,000	-----	+10,000,000
Supporting assistance.....	401,000,000	449,200,000	369,200,000	349,200,000	369,200,000	—31,800,000	—80,000,000	-----	+20,000,000
Contingency fund, general.....	99,200,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	—49,200,000	-----	-----	-----
Contingency fund, southeast Asia.....	-----	-----	89,000,000	89,000,000	89,000,000	+89,000,000	+89,000,000	-----	-----
Alliance for Progress:									
Technical cooperation and development grants.....	84,700,000	85,000,000	75,000,000	75,000,000	75,000,000	—9,700,000	—10,000,000	-----	-----
Development loans.....	425,000,000	495,125,000	445,125,000	435,125,000	435,125,000	+10,125,000	—60,000,000	—\$10,000,000	-----
Development loans.....	773,727,600	780,250,000	675,225,000	593,225,000	618,225,000	—155,502,600	—162,025,000	—57,000,000	+25,000,000
Administrative expenses, AID.....	53,600,000	55,240,000	54,240,000	54,240,000	54,240,000	+640,000	—1,000,000	-----	-----
Administrative expenses, State.....	3,029,000	3,100,000	3,100,000	3,100,000	3,100,000	+71,000	-----	-----	-----
Subtotal, economic assistance.....	2,195,000,000	2,289,470,000	2,115,000,000	1,973,000,000	2,048,000,000	—147,000,000	—241,470,000	—67,000,000	+75,000,000
MILITARY ASSISTANCE									
Military assistance.....	1,055,000,000	1,170,000,000	1,170,000,000	1,170,000,000	1,170,000,000	+115,000,000	-----	-----	-----
Limitation on administrative expenses.....	(\$4,000,000)	(\$3,500,000)	(\$3,500,000)	(\$3,500,000)	(\$3,500,000)	(—\$500,000)	-----	-----	-----
Total, title I, foreign assistance.....	3,250,000,000	3,459,470,000	3,285,000,000	3,143,000,000	3,218,000,000	—32,000,000	—241,470,000	—67,000,000	+75,000,000

Foreign assistance and related agencies appropriation bill, 1966—Continued

TITLE II—FOREIGN ASSISTANCE (OTHER)

Item	1965 appropriations	1966 budget estimates	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—			
						1965 appropriation	1966 budget estimates	House	Senate
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT									
Peace Corps.....	\$87,100,000	\$115,000,000	\$102,000,000	\$102,000,000	\$102,000,000	+\$14,900,000	-\$13,000,000		
Limitation on administrative expenses.....	(22,708,000)	(24,100,000)	(24,100,000)	(24,100,000)	(24,100,000)	(+1,392,000)			
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—CIVIL FUNCTIONS									
Ryukyu Islands, Army, administration.....	14,441,000	14,733,000	14,733,000	14,733,000	14,733,000	+292,000			
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE									
Assistance to refugees in the United States.....	32,211,000	32,265,000	32,265,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	-2,211,000	-2,265,000	-\$2,265,000	
DEPARTMENT OF STATE									
Migration and refugee assistance.....	8,200,000	7,575,000	7,575,000	7,575,000	7,575,000	-625,000			
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT									
Investment in Inter-American Development Bank.....	455,880,000	455,880,000	455,880,000	455,880,000	455,880,000				
Subscription to the International Development Association.....	61,650,000	104,000,000	104,000,000	104,000,000	104,000,000	+42,344,000			
Total, title II, foreign assistance (other).....	659,488,000	729,453,000	716,453,000	714,188,000	714,188,000	+54,700,000	-15,265,000	-2,265,000	

TITLE III—EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

Limitation on operating expenses.....	(\$1,350,000,000)	(\$1,186,120,000)	(\$1,186,120,000)	(\$1,186,120,000)	(\$1,186,120,000)	(-\$163,940,000)			
Limitation on administrative expenses.....	(8,915,000)	(4,052,000)	(4,052,000)	(4,052,000)	(4,052,000)	(+137,000)			
Total, title III, Export-Import Bank.....	(1,358,915,000)	(1,190,172,000)	(1,190,172,000)	(1,190,172,000)	(1,190,172,000)	(-163,803,000)			
Grand total, all titles.....	3,909,488,000	4,188,923,000	4,001,453,000	3,857,188,000	3,932,188,000	+22,700,000	-\$256,735,000	-\$69,265,000	+\$75,000,000

Total mutual security program regular annual appropriations—Economic and military assistance, 10 years

Fiscal year	Budget estimate	Appropriation	Reduction below estimate	Percentage below budget estimate
1956.....	\$3,266,641,750	\$2,703,341,750	-\$563,300,000	17.24
1957.....	4,859,975,000	3,766,570,000	-1,093,405,000	22.50
1958.....	3,386,860,000	2,768,760,000	-618,100,000	18.25
1959.....	3,950,092,500	3,298,092,500	-652,000,000	16.51
1960.....	4,429,995,000	3,225,813,000	-1,204,182,000	27.18
1961.....	4,275,000,000	3,716,350,000	-558,650,000	13.07
1962.....	4,775,500,000	3,914,600,000	-860,900,000	18.03
1963.....	4,961,300,000	3,928,900,000	-1,032,400,000	20.81
1964.....	4,525,325,000	3,000,000,000	-1,525,325,000	33.70
1965.....	3,516,700,000	3,250,000,000	-266,700,000	7.58
Total.....	41,947,389,250	33,572,427,250	-8,374,962,000	19.96

Foreign Assistance Act unobligated funds, title I

As of:	Amount
June 30, 1955.....	\$250,900,000
June 30, 1956.....	401,400,000
June 30, 1957.....	814,400,000
June 30, 1958.....	88,400,000
June 30, 1959.....	94,400,000
June 30, 1960.....	127,000,000
June 30, 1961.....	758,000,000
June 30, 1962.....	163,400,000
June 30, 1963.....	419,100,000
June 30, 1964.....	59,600,000
June 30, 1965.....	158,400,000

Total amount unobligated funds, 11 years..... 3,335,000,000

Average annual unobligated funds, 11 years..... 303,181,818

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 1, 1965.

To Whom It May Concern:

A great American one said: "It is true that you may fool all of the people some of the time; you can even fool some of the people all of the time; but you can't fool all of the people all of the time." This statement was made before America started the foreign giveaway program.

Requests for new foreign aid funds so far this year amount to \$7,512,467,000. I am attaching, hereto, a list showing the 15 separate requests for foreign aid funds. Only the first item on the attached list is ever mentioned publicly as being foreign aid. The other 14 items are just as much foreign aid as your hand is a part of your body.

On June 30, 1965, unliquidated funds from prior years' authority to the credit of these

15 items amounted to \$10,605,788,000. If the Congress approves the full additional \$7,512,467,000 that the administration has requested in new funds this year, then there will be a staggering total available for disbursement in the amount of \$18,118,205,000.

The \$7,512,467,000 requested in new funds this year does not include an appropriation of \$1,035 million tacked on to a recent appropriation bill for the International Monetary Fund so that it would apply to the fiscal year which ended on June 30, 1965, rather than to the new fiscal year. Neither does it include the \$4 billion annual interest we are paying on the money we have previously borrowed to give away.

How any administration could dissipate America's wealth on foreign aid as we are doing is beyond the realm of sane, human understanding. I hope that the circulation of the startling information contained in this letter will be broad enough to cause the American people to demand an explanation as to why only one of the 15 requests is ever mentioned publicly as foreign aid.

Sincerely yours,

OTTO E. PASSMAN,

Chairman, Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Enclosure.

New Foreign Aid Funds Requested So Far in 1965—July 1, 1965

[In thousands]

1. Foreign assistance requests, as amended (mutual security)..... \$3,459,470
2. Receipts and recoveries from previous credits..... 209,770

*New Foreign Aid Funds Requested So Far
in 1965—July 1, 1965—Continued*

[In thousands]

3. Military Assistance Advisory Group.....	\$76,000
4. Export-Import Bank (long-term credits).....	900,000
5. Public Law 480 (agricultural commodities).....	1,658,000
6. Inter-American Development Bank (Latin America).....	705,880
7. International Development Association (IDA).....	104,000
8. Peace Corps.....	115,000
9. Contributions to international organizations.....	96,953
10. Permanent construction overseas (military).....	85,986
11. Educational (foreign and other students).....	69,200
12. Ryukyu Islands.....	14,733
13. Migrants and refugees.....	7,575
14. Atomic Energy Commission (overseas).....	5,900
15. Inter-American Highway (Latin America).....	4,000
Total new foreign aid requests, first 6 months of 1965.....	7,512,467

OTTO E. PASSMAN,
Chairman, Foreign Operations
Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 12 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER].

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding that period of time. In turn, I shall shortly yield to the gentleman from Michigan, who presented such a forceful argument on the floor of the House at the time the Foreign Aid Appropriation bill was before us a few weeks ago.

That bill is behind us. The only issue we are in disagreement, between the two bodies, is the issue on the use of our aid funds for countries which continue to trade with North Vietnam.

Every day we read of American casualties which have occurred in southeast Asia. Just this morning I read a long list of our American boys who lost their lives in this war in which we are involved—a war in which our American boys are helping the South Vietnamese to halt the advance of communism.

One constitutional power still possessed by this House is that of appropriating funds collected from the taxpayers of the Nation. Those we represent I am sure do not approve of the use of tax dollars to support the enemy. Each of us knows this very well. When this Congress loses its power over the purse, then we, as a legislative body, are through. We have betrayed our Founding Fathers who gave us the Constitution and the framework for the greatest form of government and the greatest country in the world. The House strongly supported the Rooney amendment. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] discussed it at length a few weeks ago when

we had this bill up before us, so I am going at this time to yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN].

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I would first like to thank my colleague for yielding to me. As has been said here, I have been long disturbed about the volume of free world trade with North Vietnam. I want to take just a moment to outline to my colleagues why I am disturbed about it and the extent of this shipping. Last year, 1964, there were 401 ships from free world nations which carried cargoes to North Vietnam. So far to date there are 88 ships this year that have gone to North Vietnam with cargoes to help keep this war going. Now, these are figures that are from published commercial sources. If any of my colleagues are interested in the classified figures and are not disturbed that 88 ships went to North Vietnam, then come and look at this piece of paper here which is classified secret and you can see how many ships of the free world flags have carried their cargoes to North Vietnam.

I hope my colleagues will listen to what I have to say, because this is something that the American people should know and something they have not been told.

Of all the ships going to North Vietnam, more free world ships are going there than all of the Communist bloc ships combined. Think of that. More free world ships than Communist ships are going to North Vietnam. The conference report we had here the other day said 45 percent of all the imports to North Vietnam were on free world ships and 85 percent of their exports were on free world vessels.

Now just a bit about the background of the situation that we find ourselves in. We in this House put a prohibition in the authorization bill against aid to any country permitting its ships to trade with North Vietnam. In their wisdom the other body deleted this amendment. Then came the appropriation bill the other day. In section 107 (a) and (b) wherein we very properly said that no aid shall be given to any country that permits its ships to carry goods to Cuba, in those two sections we inserted a simple amendment, sponsored by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], and if he had not done so I had announced my intention to do so, which had only four little words, no aid to Cuba "or to Vietnam." That was the amendment. My colleagues of the House, that amendment was accepted in this very Chamber just a few days ago without a single word of dissent. No one said no. A voice was not raised against it. The other body deleted this amendment and said in essence it is the "sense of Congress" that we should not give any aid to any country that does not try to stop shipping to North Vietnam. The conferees are now substituting other language.

The language on aid to Vietnam has been accepted, so far as economic assistance is concerned, but when it comes to strategic assistance to North Vietnam we are saying that we shall treat less harshly North Vietnam shipping than we do shipping to Cuba. The issue is

very simple. Are we going to stand fast on this one amendment with respect to Vietnam, similar to the Cuban situation? What we are asking is that when it comes to shipping to the enemy we give the same identical treatment to North Vietnam as we are giving to Cuba. Why should we create a double standard here? This would give the President authority to aid countries that are in fact giving military aid to North Vietnam if he finds it in the national interest.

Why he would want this is beyond me. I cannot conceive a possible situation where free world ships would be carrying military assistance, strategic assistance to North Vietnam and have the President say that it is in our national interest to give that country aid. I cannot conceive of it, but still that is the situation we are faced with. This makes Congress look ridiculous.

Why should we be so timid? It is time we got tough and let the world know that we are serious about Vietnam, that we are going to do everything we can to see that this alarming volume of shipping to North Vietnam is stopped.

I would like to go further than we are going today. I would like to close the ports of this country to every one of these ships that sail to North Vietnam many of which, after going there, have called at our own U.S. ports. This is another urgent matter that we should consider.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat, to accept this conference report would create a double standard. We have a flat prohibition against aid to any country trading with Cuba. But we are going to say here that we intend something less than a flat prohibition against aid to countries that are sending ships to North Vietnam.

Are we not as concerned about trade with North Vietnam as we are with trade with Cuba? The President has told us that this is real war. I tell you that it is real war. I have been there; I know. If we had a declaration of war today, can you imagine the President sending aid to those who are shipping goods to our enemy? In the last war, would we have aided those trading with Japan or Germany? How ridiculous can this situation get? We now have some 130,000 troops in Vietnam. They are pouring over there so fast that you cannot keep track of the total number. Our boys are in contact with the enemy in the air, on land, and on the sea. Every day our casualties are growing. Our forces are doing what they can do to stop the enemy. We are trying to interdict the supply lines. Our planes are flying to cut them off. Just today two Air Force pilots were shot down trying to take out a bridge. Our ships are trying to stop supplies to the enemy by sea.

I say that we should make certain that none of our tax money goes to help those who are helping to supply the enemy.

Mr. Speaker, I have not had the time I would like to discuss this matter, but the issue is very simple. Are we going to have a dual standard as far as limiting aid to countries trading with Cuba and Vietnam?

The language we are using is identical to the prohibition in the Cuba section. It simply says that we shall do the same

thing with reference to Vietnam as we have done to Cuba.

This amendment was accepted without a dissenting voice in the House just a few days ago. We cannot create a double standard. The American people will never understand why we have taken action here that would make it possible to give foreign aid money under any circumstances to countries that permit their ships to aid North Vietnam. I respectfully urge that we insist upon the House amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Boggs). The Chair will advise the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER] that he has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to yield to the distinguished gentleman 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I would prefer that the gentleman from Louisiana on the other side yield some time at this time.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I strenuously urge the adoption of this conference report and request that it not be recommitted.

Mr. Speaker, this is an appropriations bill carrying over \$3 billion. This bill must be acted upon today so that the other body may act upon it expeditiously and that it does not get hung up with the proceedings in the other body which begin on Monday next with regard to repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that we have a good conference report pending before this body. It represents practically an even split between the House figures and the figures of the other body with regard to the amount of money appropriated.

Apparently, the only real controversy is over the amendment that I offered at the time this bill was under consideration here in the House. It was then that I proposed that we add the words "or to North Vietnam" to section 107(a) of the bill, as well as to section 107(b) of the bill. My amendment prevailed.

When this bill went to the other body, the other body diluted my amendment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the House conferees did succeed in having the other body recede on amendment No. 8, which was my amendment added to section 107(b), and in return, the House conferees receded from amendment No. 7, which was my amendment to 107(a), and in addition to that both sides added tightening language which is now known as section 116 of the bill. So today this language before the House is stronger than the language agreed to by the House in this year's authorization bill and it is far stronger than the provision contained in the Senate appropriations bill. It strengthens the President's hands but it does not tie them.

The only difference between the conference provision and the amendment originally adopted by the House is that the conference provision permits the President to provide assistance to a

country if he determines that it would be contrary to the national interest not to provide aid. He must report every such determination to the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it is folly to prevent the President from taking action necessary to protect our national interests. He has the facts and he has the responsibility to deal with situations and crises around the world, in Western Europe and in Greece, as well as Vietnam.

The conference provision pending before the House permits the President to exercise his responsibility to take action on the basis of the facts he has at the time of the crisis.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed recommittal motion would make it impossible to provide any military aid in this bill planned for strengthening our NATO ally, Greece.

Mr. Speaker, Greek ships are in the North Vietnam trade, and to get them out of that trade will require a decree by the Greek Government. That Government has only a two-vote margin in its Parliament. As we all know, it has suffered a prolonged Government crisis. I regret to have to say that the Greeks are simply unable at this time to take the steps necessary to end all shipping to North Vietnam.

Adoption of a recommittal motion would make mandatory a cutoff of military aid to Greece thus crippling her defense against the Communist forces on her borders, and ending her strong participation in NATO.

I submit that a vote to recommit this conference report is a vote against our Greek allies and a direct blow against the strength of NATO.

United States policy is already effective in reducing free world shipping to North Vietnam. In July and August of this year, approximately 33 free world ships called at North Vietnam ports.

In the same period last year 64 ships called at North Vietnam ports, so that in 1 year such shipping was cut almost in half.

Three of the four countries which would be affected by the Rooney amendment are taking action to cooperate with the United States on this problem. Japan has already got its ships out of the trade. The one exception is Greece which, as I have indicated, is unable to cooperate at the present time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to give some facts with regard to free world shipping in connection with North Vietnam and once again I point out that the other body has wholly receded on amendment No. 8, which concerns economic aid to countries which were dealing in economic aid with North Vietnam. As to this part of the so-called Rooney amendment, we had a complete surrender on the part of the other body. This pending conference report should be an attractive proposition to anyone who has to sit at a table to bargain with the other body at a conference. It is a good conference report that we are submitting to the House for approval today.

As the result of U.S. efforts and the fact that North Vietnam is a zone of hostilities, free world shipping to North Vietnam has declined substantially. In July and August of 1965, approximately

33 free world ships, many of them in ballast, called at North Vietnam ports. During the same months in 1964, 64 free world ships were in the North Vietnam trade.

With one exception, aid-recipient countries are actively cooperating with the United States. In the past 6 months, about 35 ships from aid-recipient countries—Greece, Norway, Liberia, and Cyprus called at North Vietnam ports and some of these ships were under long-term charter to Communist countries.

A total of 38 Japanese ships called at North Vietnam ports in January, February, and March, but since then no Japanese ships have been in the trade.

Greek ships accounted for about half of the approximately 35 ships under the registry of aid-recipient countries. Because of a prolonged governmental crisis, as I previously indicated, Greece was unable at that time to take the action necessary to control its ships in the North Vietnam trade.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman indicates that if this conference report is recommitted, the other body will hang it on the hook or otherwise refuse to deal with it. Does the gentleman mean to say the other body wants to explain, if the House approves recommitment, to the men who are being shot to pieces over in Vietnam, that shipping from foreign countries, by our so-called friends, is the means by which they are being killed and maimed?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Does the gentleman from Iowa understand that Members of the other body who were managers on the part of the Senate in this conference insisted upon their language—and the gentleman from Kansas will bear me out on this because I brought it up a number of times during the course of the conference—and insisted on their position. We came out of the conference with the best that we could get insofar as compromise was concerned.

To repeat, I had two amendments, one to section 107(a) and one to section 107(b). The Senate receded completely on the amendment to 107(b); the House conferees receded on 107(a) with the following additional language, which I think I should read to the House at this point:

SEC. 116. No assistance shall be furnished under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, to any country that sells, furnishes, or permits any ships under its registry to carry to North Vietnam any of the items mentioned in subsection 107(a) of this act unless the President determines that the withholding of such assistance would be contrary to the national interest of the United States and reports such determination to the Congress.

I respectfully submit that I have never seen a conference report on an appropriations bill come back to this House that was any clearer or more succinct than the conference report now pending before the House.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana such time as he may require.

Mr. PASSMAN. I do not believe that we should imply that the President would intentionally do anything which would cause the loss of one single American life in South Vietnam. I certainly cannot be called a Great Society enthusiast. But I do not believe that we should have the record indicating that the President of the United States would do anything which would cause the loss of a single life in South Vietnam.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I should like to ask the gentleman at this point if it is not the fact that each and every Member of the conference representing the other body submitted the same sort of statement at the conference table: that he did not want any American boy killed with ammunition brought into South Vietnam on such ships?

Mr. PASSMAN. That is true. I would like to take a minute now and summarize briefly. The language contained in this conference report is stronger than the language contained in the foreign assistance authorization bill for 1965 that this body passed not too long ago. I do not recall any Member offering an amendment at that time to recommit that bill to insist on stronger language.

Even though we had to compromise the House language in this bill I reserved on the amendment agreed to so I could study the effect of it in more detail, and I feel I am better posted now.

Let me repeat that this conference report contains stronger language than what was contained in the authorization legislation. It also contains stronger language than what was contained in the Senate bill. It is not as strong as could be but all legislation is a result of compromise. I repeat that this is the Appropriations Committee and not the policy writing committee, and I defer to the President because I know he is trying to solve these problems.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Is the language in this bill as strong as it is with respect to the prohibition of shipping to Cuba?

Mr. PASSMAN. Certainly it is not as strong.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PASSMAN. It is not the language I would desire. I am not the President and I do not have to deal with these eternal world problems and every assistance we can render him makes his job that much easier.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I believe I have 7 minutes remaining.

I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, it is not top secret that American boys in Vietnam are dying. We cannot legislate on the basis of top secret or be convinced because of top secret. I do not know what that could be. But I repeat that it is not top secret that ships of countries receiving our aid are going into North Vietnam, and it is the possibility—and I am sure the probability—that some of those ships are carrying the sinews of war which are bringing about the casualty lists that we are reading every day.

I should like to know why we should treat North Vietnam any better than we treat Cuba.

The gentleman says this is an appropriation bill and not a legislative bill, but in the appropriation bill last year this committee did not hesitate to put in the requirement that these shipments should not be made to Cuba so long as governed by the Castro regime. This is the precedent. This is the precedent for this House to take this action.

All that was done this year, in addition to the word "Castro regime," was the addition of the words "or to North Vietnam."

Are Members going to vote today to give better treatment to North Vietnam than is given to Cuba?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I do not have sufficient time, but I will yield to the gentleman, if he will make it brief, please.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I will make it very brief, in answer to the question concerning the statement just made.

Greece, in the Cuba situation, issued the necessary decrees to keep Greek ships out of Cuba at that time. When the government crisis is resolved presently in Greece—

Mr. BOW. I do not yield further, because I am concerned about the crisis of our own men in North Vietnam and in South Vietnam.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I am, too.

Mr. BOW. I do not yield further to the gentleman, if he is more interested in a crisis in Greece than a crisis in South Vietnam.

I am concerned about our country and about our men who are fighting in South Vietnam.

How much aid have we given to Greece over the years? It has been millions and hundreds of millions of dollars. Is it too much to ask them now not to ship further the sinews of war which are going to kill American men? Are we going to say to them, "It is all right, so far as Cuba is concerned, to cut them off, but let us give preferential treatment to North Vietnam?"

That is what we are being asked to do here today.

My good friend from New York, with whom I have served so long and so closely on his subcommittee, says we have to do this today because 14(b) is going to come up over in the Senate. That is almost as ridiculous, in my estimation, as is the question of the Greek situation.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will my distinguished friend from Ohio yield?

Mr. BOW. I am always glad to yield to my distinguished friend from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I am sure the gentleman will agree with me that that is one of the facts of life.

Mr. BOW. It is one of the things the gentleman is very good at doing, providing a little smokescreen once in a while when the battle gets rough and the guns are being fired.

I say to the gentleman that we have a continuing resolution, so if a debate on 14(b) starts up they will be able to go ahead just the same under the continuing resolution.

I hope we will not have any more continuing resolutions. We have one now up to October 15. I believe the debate on 14(b) will be over by October 15 and we will be able to get this bill through.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Will my distinguished friend yield to me once again, briefly.

Mr. BOW. Of course.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. It has just occurred to me, as the result of the gentleman's remarks, that the adoption of this very conference report on the foreign aid appropriations bill has always been a bellwether of sine die adjournment.

Mr. BOW. I say to my friend from New York, I will stay here until the beginning of next session of Congress if I can save the life of one American boy who may be destroyed by shipments into North Vietnam. I am not going home for that purpose.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is commendable.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Ohio 2 additional minutes, and ask the gentleman if he will yield.

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. I should like to ask the gentleman if it is not true that he would stay here the rest of this year if he could just keep one American boy from being injured?

Mr. BOW. I would.

Mr. PASSMAN. I am willing to defer to the President, however, in this matter because I believe he feels the same way.

It seems to me that this problem should have been resolved when we were considering the authorization bill conference report. That, in my opinion, is the place for the Congress to legislate. We should not have to legislate on an appropriation bill.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman's own bill of last year, a copy of which I hold in my hand, had Cuba in it, and we had the same President then we have today.

I cannot believe under any circumstances that it is necessary to put the President in here. I think the Congress has this responsibility and this right, and we should do it.

Mr. PASSMAN. I am not quarreling with the gentleman, but I think it is the only reasonable compromise that we

can arrive at on this highly controversial foreign policy matter.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD].

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me when we considered this appropriation bill initially we fully recognized that the basic authorization bill was inadequate to deal with the problem. So we took our own steps to include North Vietnam in sections 107 (a) and (b). In other words, we decided that we would put Ho Chi Minh on the same level with Castro. They are both of the same ilk. Now, when the bill comes back in the form of a conference report we find that we are differentiating between Castro and Ho Chi Minh. I do not understand that. It seems to me that if we were not strong enough in the authorization bill, we ought to take the matter in our own hands and remedy the error we made.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time to the distinguished minority leader [Mr. GERALD R. FORD].

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I simply say that we ought to recommit the conference report for the valid reasons which have been given by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER]. It seems to me that we make ourselves look ridiculous when we seek to differentiate between Cuba and North Vietnam, between Castro and Ho Chi Minh. This motion gives us in the House of Representatives, and I hope in the other body, an opportunity to work our own will to tell the American people that we will make this decision and will not make any differentiation as between Ho Chi Minh and Mr. Castro.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of the time.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining 30 seconds to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE].

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. In this brief time, I would point out that we may be considering a sugar bill in the next couple of weeks. In view of the statement of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] I would call attention to the fact that some countries who have been trading with North Vietnam will receive valuable U.S. sugar quotas under the provisions of pending sugar legislation.

In addition, there seems to be an effort in some areas of this administration for increasing trade with Russia, including the sale of wheat grown in my State. It seems about time we recognized the enemy, or enemies, in North Vietnam and suspended all trade with any country directly or indirectly responsible for the death of American boys.

Only yesterday, according to news reports, Russian-built, Russian-supplied, and I assume Russian-manned missiles reportedly shot down two more U.S. planes; and if this was not enough, Brezhnev, the Soviet Communist Party

chief, warned yesterday of a further deterioration in Soviet-American relations. It seems it is time to face up to the moral issue of trading with the enemy, and in my opinion, we should suspend all trade with Russia or any other country, Communist or non-Communist, who may be aiding and abetting North Vietnamese efforts to defeat us and destroy our young men in South Vietnam.

Let me state again that I strongly believe in providing food for peace but just as strongly deplore providing food for war.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the Chair how much time we have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Boggs). There are 15 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Louisiana has 15 minutes.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, we want to be fair about a division of this time. I want to yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER]. We are not trying to use all the time on this side. We want to yield you as much time as you need.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for the motion to recommit. It seems to me this is about "where we came in." I well remember when we were shipping scrap iron to Japan before Pearl Harbor and it came "home to roost." I served 7½ years in that war, before, during, and thereafter. The father of my three granddaughters is on active duty in South Vietnam today. Much has been said here today about trusting one man with our foreign policy, in spite of no such statement in the Constitution. I for one would feel better about this if he were not busily engaged in giving away our known and confirmed sovereign rights in the Panama Canal Zone—the one place in the world where we have an uncontested right and on which may rest the firmness of the Platt amendment and even the Monroe Doctrine. We legislated on the latter last week in this House.

I cannot imagine, in view of section 7 of article I of the Constitution, which gives directly the responsibility to the Congress to set policy respecting the support and training of armies and navies, why we should do other than what we are doing, and that is trying to help the executive branch prosecute effectively a war against invasion by communism around the world. Nor can I understand why we have not "taken out" North Vietnam's only oil storage and refinery at the port of Hanoi on the Coe River. Likewise I fail to understand why the Secretary of Defense emasculates the Reserve organization while failing to order Guard and Reserve members to active duty in a fit of power grab and political pique; in direct and agreed contravention of legislative constitutional prerogative. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I shall vote to recommit and I hope the House will do likewise.

I am certain that every American citizen was shocked by the declaration of the North Vietnam Communists last

week that they intend to execute American servicemen captured by them in the future, in utter disregard of the Geneva Convention.

It is already sufficiently shocking that the North Vietnamese have committed murder within the past 2 weeks, executing without trials, two captured American servicemen. They were soldiers, following the orders of superiors. As such, their execution in alleged reprisal for the executions of three Vietcong terrorists, convicted by the South Vietnamese for acts of subversion and espionage, can only be considered an act of wanton murder.

The civilized world should have been as horrified by this declaration of savagery; yet, incredible as it seems, no cry of protest has been raised in the United Nations. Surely, in a world body which is supposed to represent the world conscience, there is no excuse to shut its eyes, bind its mouth, and hold its ears to an act more befitting of the Stone Age than the 20th century.

Brutal as warfare is, there are certain recognized practices—including humane treatment of prisoners, which all civilized nations have observed. Nowhere in recent history, except perhaps the Congo, has there been such an inhuman pronouncement as the one by the Communist Government of North Vietnam. What better indication of the true intentions of the Communist world that not a single Communist nation—whether in the Russian camp or the Chinese camp—has publicly condemned the announcement.

When the United States felt it practical to make use of tear gas, which rendered its Vietcong enemies in tears and ill at their stomachs for a brief period, the hue and cry around the world was deafening. This harmless gas—used by the police forces of many nations—was not in contravention of any article of the Geneva Convention. Yet, the world—our friends as well as our enemies—literally "raised the roof."

But, in the face of wanton murder, where—we must ask—are those voices of condemnation, which felt no compunction about berating the United States? Neither our friends, nor our enemies, have seen fit to voice complaint or protest.

The United Nations sleeps, unwilling to express its conviction, and afraid lest it offend the Communist bloc. I well recall that another world body tried to ignore savagery, when an Ethiopian Emperor pleaded for help against Mussolini's legions. And, failing to react in a moment of crisis, it eventually disintegrated.

Surely, it is apparent now, that every Communist reaction to any issue is based on only one question, Will it advance or retard Communist control over the remaining free world?

The author of "Advise and Consent", Allan Drury, has written another book, "Three Kids in a Cart." It contains the following passage, which I would like to quote:

There has never been any evidence at any hour of the day, except that which we ourselves have blown out of all proportion with

our desperate hopes, to indicate that the Communists have ever had any intention of permitting peace to come to the world, or do anything but destroy the free civilization of the West. Each little crumb which has fallen from their table has been hailed as 10 loaves of bread—by us.

Each conciliatory gesture, always made with a devious purpose, has been turned into hopeful signs—by us. And, while we have been busy telling ourselves we saw good faith where good faith never existed, the patient plan of murder and deceit and our ultimate destruction has gone forward, unchanged to the slightest degree by the self-delusions we have desperately clung to.

Surely, the murder of prisoners of war will eliminate any further self-delusions by any American who has accepted the myth of peaceful coexistence.

Surely this is a time to rescue ourselves from apathy, to strengthen our resolve to resist the Communist invader from the North and to serve notice to the Communists and to the other nations of the world that freedom's light will not be snuffed out by acts of terror and wanton murder.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding; and I shall not take much time.

Mr. Speaker, at least two points ought to be kept in mind in the consideration of this matter. First, what we are asking here is that Members not tie the hands of the President of the United States in administering this program. The President is not going to let one thing happen anywhere that will jeopardize our safety. The President is our Commander in Chief. We trust him with atomic weapons and all the military power of our country. What the President needs is the power to protect the lives of our people. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, cutting off of aid will not necessarily stop shipments; and that is what we are interested in doing. We are interested in stopping shipments to North Vietnam by all of our allies. But if we cut off aid to Greece, the private shipping interests in Greece, under the government under which that country operates, could continue to make shipments into North Vietnam. It seems to me that if we give this authority to the President we will enable him to use his good offices to persuade our allies to persuade in turn their private shipping interests to stop these shipments. This is the only way that we can hope to get done what all Members want done.

The President has a great record in this regard. The shipments into North Vietnam from countries friendly to the United States have gone down considerably under the persuasion of the President. The President is doing the job. We must not tie his hands and make it impossible for him to function in the national interest.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished and able chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I stand firm behind the statement of the ma-

jority leader. This is going to be a determination by the President of the United States. I am sure everybody in this Chamber has confidence in our President. He is not going to let any ships go into the ports of North Vietnam carrying material from our allies that are going to destroy the lives of American boys.

I wish that some of the Members who have spoken here about saving the lives of American boys had acted differently 3 weeks ago when we had before us an appropriation to furnish guns and jeeps and ammunition for the boys fighting in South Vietnam by supporting the foreign military assistance part of the foreign aid program. It seems peculiar to me that they can come in here and say, "We want to save lives in South Vietnam," but 3 weeks ago when we had the military assistance program many votes on the minority side were cast in the negative.

This is a determination by your President, who is solely responsible for foreign policy. Let us have confidence in the President of the United States.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

I am talking about this very bill that we have in conference today.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. There is some difference between the appropriation bill for the support of our own U.S. Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines, and this bill. Everybody voted for that bill.

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman voted for the bill, but many Members who are opposing this section have never supported military assistance.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. But, just a minute, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is not being clear. The foreign aid appropriation bill does not provide one bullet or one bit of equipment for any U.S. military personnel.

With reference to the appropriations bill for our own forces, every Member of this House, Democrat and Republican, voted for it. Now, that is the only place in which we supply guns and ammunition for our own troops.

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman is familiar that a part of the foreign aid military assistance goes to supply the joint effort of the United States forces and the South Vietnamese forces in our fight against Vietcong.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The appropriation contained in the foreign aid bill goes to those nations that are allied with us and not our own forces.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD].

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time only for the purpose of clarifying what I believe was unfortunately a wrong impression created. Every Member of this House, as I recall it, voted unanimously to support our own military budget for the Departments of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force.

There was some disagreement on the appropriation bill for the foreign aid program. But I know of no amendment that was offered by anyone to make

a reduction in the military assistance portion of that appropriation bill. There have been some reservations by some concerning the economic assistance. But if we had the military assistance portion of the foreign aid program isolated so all would have the choice of voting either "yes" or "no" on that, I do not think a single Member of this body on either side of the aisle would oppose that portion of the program.

So, Mr. Speaker, when some Members on both sides of the aisle have voted against the authorization or the appropriation for the foreign aid program, I believe there has been a reflection that they had violent disagreement with the economic assistance rather than the military assistance.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Not right now, but I shall yield to the gentleman later if I have time.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I have traditionally and forcefully on almost every occasion favored both the authorization and the appropriation bill for the foreign aid program. I believe in it. I think it is right. But I think it was unfortunate that the implication was raised that some Members—and I do not know which Members the gentleman from Pennsylvania was speaking about—had not voted to support the military assistance for our own forces.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the minority leader.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, knowing of the years of service that the gentleman has put in on the Committee on Appropriations and knowing of his great interest in military assistance, I remember the day that the gentleman from Michigan took the floor in favor of increasing the military assistance in the foreign aid bill by \$100 million. The gentleman has been a great defender of the military assistance program. But surely the gentleman from the knowledge he has, having served on the Military Appropriations Subcommittee and on the great Committee on Appropriations and through his years of service on the full Committee on Appropriations fully realizes that every dollar we send into South Vietnam, whether it comes out of our own military appropriations or the military assistance program is a joint endeavor to win this war. So you cannot make a decision here today saying that you do not want to sacrifice the life of one American soldier because in many places in South Vietnam, and the gentleman knows this, in many places in South Vietnam the South Vietnamese army is the army that is guarding our military installation.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Let me make this one final comment.

Every ship that goes into a North Vietnamese port whether it is a Soviet bloc

ship or a free world ship complicates our military problem in Vietnam. So what this amendment provided in the House bill, and the gentleman from New York was wise to offer it, precluded that. I hope and trust that we will stand firm against this conference report and vote to recommit it.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee. A moment ago he said during the debate that if the House deletes the Rooney amendment, it would boil down to North Vietnam getting favored treatment over Cuba. This is the thing that bothers me, Mr. Speaker, and bothers me deeply. Do you feel we are less at war with North Vietnam than we are with Cuba? If not, how can you justify deleting sanctions against shipping to North Vietnam when we have taken them as regards Cuba?

Mr. PASSMAN. The gentleman has made a statement of fact. I do not like some of the things that this Congress is doing any more than the gentleman from North Dakota does. We are dealing with a foreign policy question and dealing with something that should have been handled by the legislative committees and not by the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I am trusting the President on this matter of foreign policy. We are supposed to have a nonpartisan foreign policy. I do not believe the President would take a chance on losing one single American life. I am willing to trust him. I am willing to take his word that there are certain conditions existing now, and that, therefore, he needs the language that is in this bill.

I want to say I am certainly in complete sympathy with some of the statements that have been made today. But there is no such thing as having legislation just as we want it. We have stronger language in this conference report than what was contained in the conference report on the authorizing legislation. The conference report also contains stronger language than what was contained in the Senate appropriation bill. When we had the conference report on the authorization bill before us that was the proper time to write strong legislation on the subject and not to wait to within a few days of adjournment sine die and bring up highly controversial foreign policy questions and move to recommit this appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time on the conference report to the very distinguished, able and sincere chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] for yielding to me the remaining 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the position which the gentleman from Louisiana has just taken in regard to the pending conference report and the position which he has just taken against the forthcoming motion to recommit the bill.

This bill has in it some \$670 million, plus, for southeast Asia. Much of it is to equip South Vietnamese soldiers—to equip them and to feed them and to help them fight the battles and share the sacrifices in this war for freedom in South Vietnam. I support this contribution to encourage the South Vietnamese to share in the cost, and in the fighting, and in the dying in South Vietnam.

Some seem to be troubled by the fact that the restrictive language provisions in the bill and the conference report with respect to Cuba and with respect to North Vietnam are a bit different. The present restrictive language with respect to Cuba came about principally in 1962. Many countries were trading with Cuba at that time. Over a period of weeks and months our Government was able to shut off free world shipping to Cuba by countries which were receiving our aid. But it took some time. As the gentleman from New York has said, we are now making progress in shutting off all free world shipping to North Vietnam. Our objective, of course, is to shut off all free world shipping to North Vietnam; but this is not something that the President feels can be done immediately or overnight, especially in view of the situation in Greece. A number of Greek ships are involved. It is taking time. We all favor taking every appropriate step toward the elimination of all free world shipping to North Vietnam. This is certainly my position and my objective in supporting the conference agreement.

In this bill, which the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] is asking you to vote for—and which I hope you will support—we have forbidden aid to any country which provides, sells, or ships in its vessels material to North Vietnam. We forbid it. We then propose to add the proviso—

Unless the President determines that the withholding of such assistance would be contrary to the national interest of the United States and reports such determination to the Congress.

In other words, we are trusting the President as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces; we are trusting him as our spokesman in foreign policy, just as we have always trusted our Presidents in foreign policy matters. My point is, Why not trust him who is in command of our Armed Forces in South Vietnam in this matter of shipping and working out these arrangements which are well underway and which have been quite successful in part thus far? Why not continue to trust him in this matter? We trust him with many vital national mat-

ters affecting our freedom, our security, our lives. We trust him with his finger on the trigger of the atomic bomb. Under our system the President is automatically charged with many awesome responsibilities.

A vote otherwise could in my judgment be interpreted as a vote of no confidence in the President in this matter. This is certainly not the desire of any Members of the House on either side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, in elaboration, may I say that the casual reader of this RECORD or those not acquainted with the details of the various provisions of the bill might gather that this conference agreement with respect to modification of the North Vietnam restriction represented a radical departure from precedent or practice. On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, Congress has repeatedly recognized the need for Presidential discretion in highly sensitive situations where national security is involved. Cutting off shipping to North Vietnam is not the only question at stake; as indicated earlier, important relationships with NATO allies vital to our security might well be adversely affected if in our well-intentioned desire to hamstring North Vietnam in every way possible we should unwisely tie our President's hands. That is what we have tried to avoid, and that is our aim in this conference agreement to which some objection has been voiced.

But more specifically, Mr. Speaker, the whole of the truth about the pending provision is this: The only real difference—the only difference of substance—between the original House passed version and the conference version is that the conference version permits the Presidential discretion which I mentioned. That is the only difference. And there is nothing new or radical about that.

Elsewhere in the pending bill, in amendment No. 10, we prohibit assistance to Nasser's United Arab Republic unless—and I am reading from the bill itself—

Unless the President determines that such availability is essential to the national interest of the United States.

Elsewhere in the bill, in amendment 11, we prohibit assistance to Sukarno's Indonesia unless—and I am reading from the bill itself—

Unless the President determines that such availability is essential to the national interest of the United States.

Furthermore, Congress did a similar thing earlier this session with respect to Nasser and the United Arab Republic when we had up the Commodity Credit Corporation supplemental appropriation in January. In that instance, we prohibited the use of any funds to export any of our agricultural commodities to the United Arab Republic except—and this is the point—except when—and I quote from the law—

Except when the President determines that the financing of such exports is in the national interest.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, for the sake of emphasis, I must repeat something others have said, because it is pertinent and it is important to an evaluation of

the question: The conference agreement against North Vietnam shipping is stronger—much stronger—than what Congress adopted only a few weeks ago in the foreign aid authorization bill. And the conference prohibition is also much stronger than the Senate amendment 9 which it replaces.

Both the authorization bill and the Senate amendment in the pending bill merely constituted expressions of the sense of Congress about cutting off aid under the given circumstances. But the conference agreement is a mandatory provision—not merely an expression of a view. And the conference agreement is as strict, as strong, and as prohibitive as the original House restrictions in this appropriation bill with the single and sole exception of the Presidential discretion provision, which reads—

Unless the President determines that the withholding of such assistance would be contrary to the national interest of the United States and reports such determination to the Congress.

During President Eisenhower's administration, discretionary language was likewise adopted by Congress in dealing with sensitive international situations in Yugoslavia. There are other examples. This policy grows out of a realization of the fact that often there are unpredictable changes in world trouble spots which require flexibility of action by the President if he is to serve the best interest of the United States.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope the coming motion to recommit the conference report will fail, and that we retain in the bill language forbidding shipments to North Vietnam except in certain instances and circumstances in which the President determines—as he must under the conference bill—that it is in the national interest to do otherwise and notifies the Congress to that effect.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I wonder if the distinguished chairman of the committee could give us an example of a case in which the President of the United States might determine that it was in the national interest of our country to permit free world ships to carry military hardware to North Vietnam?

Mr. MAHON. The President does not favor the carrying of military hardware to North Vietnam.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. That is the discretion we are giving him, is it not?

Mr. MAHON. I believe he needs the discretion which is in the pending bill in working with certain of our NATO allies until this matter can be handled in such a way as to enhance the stature of the United States in the NATO countries and also take care of our interests in southeast Asia. It seems to me that this is certainly a very wise position for us to take at this time under the circumstances.

Mr. PASSMAN. The President would never permit such a thing to happen if it was within his power to prevent it.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the measure before makes available

United States aid to Mexico. The amount is undisclosed, yet last year United States aid to Mexico totaled almost \$25 million.

It is curious that \$25 million is the official amount of trade Mexico exported to Communist Cuba last year. Unofficial yet reliable sources show 1964 Mexican-Cuban trade to be worth at least three times that amount.

It must be noted that the Organization of American States is desperately trying to enforce an economic and diplomatic boycott of Communist Cuba. Mexico seems oblivious of this official attempt by all the nations of this hemisphere to quarantine Fidel Castro.

As the leading nation in the Western Hemisphere, the United States should be the first to initiate reprisals against those foreign countries who thwart the will of the majority of the nations in the hemisphere.

United States relations with Mexico have been cordial. The fact that Americans purchased over \$600 million in goods from their Mexican neighbors last year shows the good will which exists between the two countries. However, with the true nature of the Castro regime shown as virtually against the principles of the free world, those who administer the U.S. foreign aid program ought to use this Nation's generosity with Mexico as a lever to obtain an end to Mexico's aid to Communist Cuba.

I urge the Congress to impress these principles in our foreign policy.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. SHRIVER. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The clerk read as follows:

Mr. SHRIVER moves to recommit the conference report to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist upon disagreement to amendment No. 7.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 164, nays 174, not voting 94, as follows:

[Roll No. 347]

YEAS—164

Abbott
Abernethy
Andrews,
N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Ayres
Baldwin
Baring
Bates
Battin

Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bow
Brock
Brookfield
Brooklyn, N.C.
Brooklyn, Va.
Buchanan
Byrnes, Wis.

Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen,
Don H.
Clawson, Del.
Cleveland
Collier
Conable
Conte
Corbett

Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Fascell
Findley
Fisher
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Gathings
Gettys
Gibbons
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Herlong
Horton
Hull

Hungate
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kunkel
Langen
Lennon
Lipscomb
McCarthy
McClary
McDade
McEwen
McMillan
MacGregor
Marsh
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mills
Minshall
Moeller
Moore
Morton
Mosher
Nelsen
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
O'Neal, Ga.
Pelly
Pike
Poff
Pool
Pucinski
Quile
Quillen
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke

NAYS—174

Adams
Albert
Anderson,
Tenn.
Annunzio
Ashley
Bandstra
Barrett
Beckworth
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Boiling
Brademas
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Callan
Cameron
Chelf
Clark
Clevenger
Cohelan
Conyers
Corman
Craley
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
de la Garza
Delaney
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Felghan
Flood
Fogarty
Foley
Ford,
William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz

Gialmo
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Gray
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffiths
Hagen, Calif.
Hamilton
Hansen, Wash.
Harris
Hathaway
Hechler
Helstoski
Hicks
Holland
Howard
Huot
Irwin
Jacobs
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Krebs
Landrum
Leggett
Long, Md.
Love
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
McVicker
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Maillard
Matsunaga
Meeds
Miller
Minish
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morrison
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher

Roberts
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Roush
Rumsfeld
Satterfield
Saylor
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secrest
Selden
Shriver
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Stanton
Stubblefield
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Tuten
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Weitner
Whalley
White, Tex.
Whitener
Wildnall
Williams
Wolff
Wylder
Younger

Nedzi
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Poage
Powell
Price
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Rhodes, Pa.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
Scheuer
Schlesler
Schmidhauser
Senger
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Staggers
Staubaum
Sullivan
Tenzer
Todd
Trimble
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
White, Idaho
Whitten
Willis
Wilson,
Charles H.
Wright
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—94

Adair	Grabowski	Morris
Addabbo	Green, Oreg.	Morse
Anderson, Ill.	Halleck	Nix
Andrews,	Hanley	Pirnie
George W.	Hansen, Iowa	Purcell
Andrews,	Hardy	Race
Glenn	Harsha	Redlin
Aspinall	Hawkins	Reuss
Bolton	Hays	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bonner	Hébert	Rivers, S.C.
Bray	Henderson	Rivers, Alaska
Burton, Utah	Holifield	Roncalio
Cahill	Hosmer	Roudebush
Callaway	Johnson, Okla.	St. Onge
Carter	Kee	Scott
Celler	Keogh	Shipley
Colmer	Kirwan	Smith, Iowa
Cooley	Kluczynski	Steed
Curtis	Kornegay	Stephens
Dawson	Laird	Stratton
Dent	Latta	Sweeney
Dorn	Lindsay	Thomas
Dow	Long, La.	Thompson, N.J.
Duncan, Oreg.	McCulloch	Thompson, Tex.
Dyal	Macdonald	Toll
Evins, Tenn.	Martin, Ala.	Tunney
Fino	Mathias	Tupper
Flynt	Matthews	Utt
Frelinghuysen	May	Wilson, Bob
Gilligan	Michel	Wyatt
Goodell	Mize	Yates

So the motion to recommitt was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Keogh against.
Mr. Long of Louisiana for, with Mr. Kirwan against.

Mr. Kornegay for, with Mrs. Kelly against.
Mr. Adair for, with Mr. Dent against.
Mr. Roudebush for, with Mr. Celler against.
Mr. Burton of Utah for, with Mr. Carey against.

Mr. Bob Wilson for, with Mr. Dow against.
Mr. Callaway for, with Mr. Dyal against.
Mr. Carter for, with Mr. Gilligan against.
Mrs. May for, with Mr. Purcell against.
Mr. Latta for, with Mrs. Green of Oregon against.

Mr. Hosmer for, with Mr. Holifield against.
Mr. Laird for, with Mr. Yates against.
Mr. Curtis for, with Mr. Toll against.
Mr. Henderson for, with Mr. Thompson of New Jersey against.

Mr. Fino for, with Mr. Sweeney against.
Mr. Martin of Alabama for, with Mr. St. Onge against.

Mr. Bray for, with Mr. Hays against.
Mr. Utt for, with Mr. Cooley against.
Mr. Wyatt for, with Mr. Dawson against.
Mr. Dorn for, with Mr. Tunney against.
Mr. Scott for, with Mr. Roncalio against.
Mr. Stephens for, with Mr. Hawkins against.

Mr. Flynt for, with Mr. Kee against.
Mr. George W. Andrews for, with Mr. Reuss against.

Mr. Pirnie for, with Mr. Rivers of Alaska against.
Mr. Rhodes of Arizona for, with Mr. Hanley against.

Mr. Glenn Andrews for, with Mr. Grabowski against.
Mr. Harsha for, with Mr. Hansen of Iowa against.

Mr. Anderson of Illinois for, with Mr. Macdonald against.

Mr. Mize for, with Mr. Nix against.
Mr. Michel for, with Mr. Redlin against.
Mr. Cahill for, with Mr. Stratton against.
Mr. Matthews for, with Mr. Duncan of Oregon against.

Mr. Race for, with Mr. Kluczynski against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Shipley with Mr. Lindsay.
Mr. Morris with Mr. Morse.
Mr. Thomas with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Goodell.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Hardy with Mr. Tupper.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mrs. Bolton.
Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Steed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 204, nays 127, not voting 101, as follows:

[Roll No. 348]

YEAS—204

Adams	Gallagher	Natcher
Albert	Garmatz	Nedzi
Anderson,	Gialmo	O'Brien
Tenn.	Gilbert	O'Hara, Ill.
Annunzio	Gonzalez	O'Hara, Mich.
Arends	Gray	Olsen, Mont.
Ashley	Green, Pa.	Olson, Minn.
Ayres	Greigg	O'Neill, Mass.
Baldwin	Grider	Ottenger
Bandstra	Griffin	Passman
Barrett	Griffiths	Patten
Bates	Hagen, Calif.	Pelly
Beckworth	Halpern	Pepper
Bell	Hamilton	Perkins
Bingham	Hanna	Philbin
Blatnik	Hansen, Wash.	Pickle
Boggs	Harris	Pike
Boland	Hathaway	Powell
Bolling	Hechler	Price
Brademas	Helstoski	Pucinski
Brooks	Hicks	Quile
Broomfield	Holland	Reld, N.Y.
Brown, Calif.	Horton	Resnick
Burke	Howard	Rhodes, Pa.
Burton, Calif.	Huot	Robison
Byrne, Pa.	Irwin	Rodino
Cabell	Jacobs	Rogers, Colo.
Callan	Joelson	Ronan
Cameron	Johnson, Calif.	Rooney, N.Y.
Clark	Jones, Ala.	Rooney, Pa.
Cleveland	Karsten	Rosenthal
Clevenger	Karth	Rostenkowski
Cohelan	Kastenmeier	Roybal
Conable	King, Calif.	Ryan
Conte	King, Utah	St. Germain
Conyers	Krebs	Schauer
Corbett	Kunkel	Schuler
Corman	Landrum	Schmidhauser
Craley	Leggett	Schweiker
Culver	Long, Md.	Selden
Daddario	Love	Senner
Daniels	McCarthy	Sickles
Delaney	McDade	Sisk
Denton	McDowell	Smith, N.Y.
Diggs	McFall	Springer
Dingell	McGrath	Stafford
Donohue	McVicker	Staggers
Downing	Machen	Staibbaum
Dulski	Mackay	Sullivan
Dwyer	Mackie	Teague, Calif.
Edmondson	Madden	Tenzer
Edwards, Calif.	Mahon	Todd
Evans, Colo.	Mailhard	Trimble
Fallon	Martin, Mass.	Udall
Farbstein	Matsunaga	Van Deerlin
Farnsey	Meeds	Vanik
Farnum	Müller	Vigorito
Fascell	Minish	Vivian
Fieghan	Mink	Weitner
Flood	Monagan	Whalley
Fogarty	Moorhead	White, Idaho
Foley	Morgan	Widnall
Ford, Gerald R.	Morrison	Wilson,
Ford,	Morton	Charles H.
William D.	Moss	Wolf
Fraser	Multer	Wright
Friedel	Murphy, Ill.	Wylder
Fulton, Pa.	Murphy, N.Y.	Young
Fulton, Tenn.	Murray	Zablocki

NAYS—127

Abblitt	Baring	Bonner
Abernethy	Battin	Bow
Andrews,	Belcher	Brook
N. Dak.	Bennett	Broyhill, N.C.
Ashbrook	Berry	Broyhill, Va.
Ashmore	Betts	Buchanan

Burleson	Gurney	Quillen
Byrnes, Wis.	Hagan, Ga.	Randall
Casey	Haley	Reid, Ill.
Cederberg	Hail	Reifel
Chamberlain	Hansen, Idaho	Reinecke
Chelf	Harvey, Ind.	Roberts
Clancy	Harvey, Mich.	Rogers, Fla.
Clausen,	Herlong	Rogers, Tex.
Don H.	Hull	Roush
Clawson, Del	Hungate	Rumsfeld
Collier	Hutchinson	Satterfield
Cramer	Ichord	Saylor
Cunningham	Jarman	Schneebell
Curtin	Jennings	Secrest
Dague	Johnson, Pa.	Shriver
Davis, Ga.	Jonas	Skubitz
Davis, Wis.	Jones, Mo.	Smith, Calif.
de la Garza	Keith	Smith, Va.
Derwinski	King, N.Y.	Stubblefield
Devine	Langen	Talcott
Dickinson	Lennon	Taylor
Dole	Lipscomb	Teague, Tex.
Dowdy	McClory	Thomson, Wis.
Duncan, Tenn.	McMillan	Tuck
Edwards, Ala.	Marsh	Tuten
Elsworth	Martin, Nebr.	Waggonner
Erlenborn	Mills	Walker, Miss.
Everett	Minshall	Walker, N. Mex.
Fisher	Moeller	Watkins
Fountain	Moore	Watson
Fuqua	Mosher	Watts
Gathings	Nelsen	White, Tex.
Gettys	O'Konski	Whitener
Gibbons	O'Neal, Ga.	Whitten
Gross	Poage	Williams
Grover	Poff	Willis
Gubser	Pool	Younger

NOT VOTING—101

Adair	Halleck	Nix
Addabbo	Hanley	Patman
Anderson, Ill.	Hansen, Iowa	Pirnie
Andrews,	Hardy	Purcell
George W.	Harsha	Race
Andrews,	Hawkins	Redlin
Glenn	Hays	Reuss
Aspinall	Hébert	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bolton	Henderson	Rivers, Alaska
Bray	Holifield	Rivers, S.C.
Burton, Utah	Hosmer	Roncalio
Cahill	Johnson, Okla.	Roudebush
Callaway	Kee	St. Onge
Carey	Kelly	Scott
Carter	Keogh	Shipley
Celler	Kirwan	Sikes
Colmer	Kluczynski	Slack
Cooley	Kornegay	Smith, Iowa
Curtis	Laird	Stanton
Dawson	Latta	Steed
Dent	Lindsay	Stephens
Dorn	Long, La.	Stratton
Dow	McCulloch	Sweeney
Duncan, Oreg.	McEwen	Thomas
Dyal	Macdonald	Thompson, N.J.
Evins, Tenn.	MacGregor	Thompson, Tex.
Findley	Martin, Ala.	Toll
Fino	Mathias	Tunney
Flynt	Matthews	Tupper
Frelinghuysen	May	Ullman
Gilligan	Michel	Utt
Goodell	Mize	Wilson, Bob
Grabowski	Morris	Wyatt
Green, Oreg.	Morse	Yates

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Hébert against.
Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. Kornegay against.
Mr. Kluczynski for, with Mr. Henderson against.

Mrs. Kelly for, with Mr. Scott against.
Mr. Holifield for, with Mr. Shipley against.
Mr. Addabbo for, with Mr. Sikes against.
Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Stephens against.
Mr. Macdonald for, with Mr. George W. Andrews against.

Mr. Gilligan for, with Mr. Colmer against.
Mr. Evins for, with Mr. Dorn against.
Mr. Slack for, with Mr. Flynt against.
Mr. Hays for, with Mr. Rivers of South Carolina against.

Mr. Casey for, with Mr. Race against.
Mr. Cooley for, with Mr. Morris against.
Mr. Dow for, with Mr. Steed against.
Mrs. Bolton for, with Mr. Glenn Andrews against.

Mr. Morse for, with Mr. Harsha against.

Mr. MacGregor for, with Mr. Carter against.
Mr. Cahill for, with Mr. Utt against.
Mr. Frelinghuysen for, with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona against.

Mr. Pirnie for, with Mr. Bob Wilson against.
Mr. Mathias for, with Mr. Adair against.
Mr. Lindsay for, with Mr. Callaway against.
Mr. Tupper for, with Mr. Roubenush against.

Mr. Dent for, with Mr. Michel against.
Mr. Dyal for, with Mr. Stanton against.
Mr. Toll for, with Mr. Martin of Alabama against.

Mr. Nix for, with Mr. McEwen against.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey for, with Mr. Latta against.

Mr. St. Onge for, with Mr. Laird against.
Mr. Hanley for, with Mr. Fino against.
Mr. Purcell for, with Mr. Curtis against.
Mr. Stratton for, with Mr. Burton of Utah against.

Mr. Sweeney for, with Mr. Long of Louisiana against.

Mr. Yates for, with Mr. Wyatt against.
Mr. Kee for, with Mrs. May against.
Mr. Reuss for, with Mr. Mize against.
Mrs. Green of Oregon for, with Mr. Bray against.

Mr. Redlin for, with Mr. Anderson of Illinois against.

Mr. Rivers of Alaska for, with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma against.

Mr. Smith of Iowa for, with Mr. McCulloch against.

Mr. Grabowski for, with Mr. Findley against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Thomas with Mr. Hardy.
Mr. Hansen of Iowa with Mr. Tunney.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. Roncalio with Mr. Patman.
Mr. Matthews with Mr. Duncan of Oregon.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 9: Page 12, line 9, insert:

"SEC. 116. In determining whether the funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this Act for assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, may be used for assistance to any country, the President shall take into account such steps as that country has taken to prevent ships under its registry from transporting strategic items, items of economic assistance, or other equipment, materials or commodities to North Vietnam. If any country receiving assistance fails to take appropriate steps to prevent its ships from transporting such items, it is the sense of the Congress that assistance should be denied to that country."

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PASSMAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed, insert the following:

"SEC. 116. No assistance shall be furnished under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, to any country that sells, furnishes or permits any ships under its registry to carry to North Vietnam any of the items mentioned in subsection 107(a) of this Act unless the President determines that the withholding of such assistance would be contrary to the national interest of the United States and reports such determination to the Congress."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 10: Page 12, line 20, insert:

"SEC. 117. None of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act for carrying out the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, shall be available for assistance to the United Arab Republic, unless the President determines that such availability is essential to the national interest of the United States."

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PASSMAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 11: Page 13, line 1, insert:

"SEC. 118. None of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act for carrying out the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, shall be available for assistance to Indonesia, unless the President determines that such availability is essential to the national interest of the United States."

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PASSMAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the conference report and on the several motions was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report just adopted by the House.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DISMISSAL OF COURT ACTION—MESSAGE FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Department of Justice:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, September 29, 1965.
Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: We enclose a copy of an order entered by the court on September 14, 1965, in the action entitled *The All-America Protectorate, Inc. v. Lyndon B. Johnson, et al.*, Civil No. 1583-65, in which you were named as a defendant. As indicated in the court's order, this action has now been dismissed by the court.

Accordingly, at an appropriate time after the appeal period has expired, we will close our files in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. DOUGLAS,
Assistant Attorney General.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the order will be recorded in the Journal and in the RECORD.

[U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia—Civil action No. 1583-65]

THE ALL-AMERICA PROTECTORATE, INCORPORATED, PLAINTIFF, v. LYNDON B. JOHNSON, INDIVIDUALLY AND AS PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; MIKE MANSFIELD, INDIVIDUALLY AND AS MAJORITY LEADER OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE; EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, INDIVIDUALLY AND AS MINORITY LEADER OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE; JOHN W. MCCORMACK, INDIVIDUALLY AND AS SPEAKER OF THE UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES; CARL B. ALBERT, INDIVIDUALLY AND AS MAJORITY LEADER OF THE UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES; AND GERALD R. FORD, INDIVIDUALLY AND AS MINORITY LEADER OF THE UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, DEFENDANTS

ORDER

Upon consideration of defendants' motion to dismiss and the memorandum of points and authorities in support thereof and in opposition thereto, and it appearing to the court that plaintiff lacks standing to maintain this action, that the complaint fails to raise a justiciable controversy, and that this court lacks jurisdiction to enter an order directing Members of the Congress to perform a legislative function, it is by the court this 14th day of September 1965,

Ordered, That defendants' motion to dismiss be and it hereby is granted, and that the action be and it hereby is dismissed.

J. STRICA,
U.S. District Judge.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that service of the foregoing proposed order has been made upon the plaintiff by mailing a copy thereof to its attorney, Lovell W. George, Esq., 8015 Forsyth Boulevard, Clayton, Mo., 31405, on this 14th day of September 1965.

ARNOLD T. AIKENS,
Assistant U.S. Attorney.

MEDICAL LIBRARY ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1965

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, and in behalf of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING], I call up House Resolution 590 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3142) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a program of grants to assist in meeting the need for adequate medical library services and facilities. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such

amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH], and pending that, I yield myself such time as I might require.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 590 provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate for consideration of H.R. 3142, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a program of grants to assist in meeting the need for adequate medical library services and facilities.

For some years concern has been expressed over the needs of medical libraries for expansion, renovation, and improved services. If these libraries are unable to meet the need for expanded facilities and services, much of the ever-increasing volume of knowledge and information in the health sciences will be inaccessible to many scientists.

Studies conducted in 1963, 1964, and 1965 indicate that medical libraries have been unable to stay abreast of the mounting medical and scientific literature.

The 1963 study indicated that the additional space needs of the 87 medical school libraries would cost an estimated \$100 million. Space needs reported by 79 medical schools in the 1965 questionnaire indicated a total need of over 2.5 million square feet, or an average per school need of 32,000 square feet.

The 1965 questionnaire also indicated a total need of over 1.3 million volumes or an average school need of 18,000 additional volumes and periodicals.

In addition to their needs for additional space and volumes, the schools reported on their needs for support for cataloging, binding, and other instructional media or equipment. The average per school need for these other library resources is \$132,000.

The average medical school library would have to expend over \$1 million above expected budget allotments in the next 5 years to meet library needs as currently estimated. This does not include the additional costs of staffing, equipping, and maintaining expanded facilities for the needed increases in volume holdings.

The purpose of H.R. 3142 is to establish a program of grants to finance the construction of medical library facilities, the training of biomedical librarians and information specialists, the expansion and improvement of medical library resources, research and development in medical library science, the support of special scholarly scientific projects, the establishment of regional medical libraries, and the establishment of regional branches of the National Library of Medicine.

Appropriations authorizations to carry out the purposes of the bill would total \$105 million over a 5-year period.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the resolution (H. Res. 590) be adopted.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 590 will provide for an open rule, with 2 hours of general debate, for consideration of H.R. 3142, to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a program of grants to assist in meeting the need for adequate medical library services and facilities.

The purposes of the bill are to establish a program of grants to finance the construction of medical library facilities, the training of biomedical librarians, the expansion and improvement of medical library resources, the establishment of regional medical libraries, and the establishment of regional branches of the National Library of Medicine. The program covers 5 fiscal years, ending June 30, 1970, at a cost of \$105 million.

Section 393 covers assistance for construction of facilities. The section authorizes the Surgeon General, upon application by any public or nonprofit institution, to make grants to help such institution in meeting construction costs of a medical library facility. The application must be recommended by the National Medical Libraries Assistance Advisory Board—whose membership is identical with the Board of Regents of the National Library of Medicine—and approved by the Surgeon General after making the following determinations: First, the construction is necessary to meet the needs of the area where it will be located; second, provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act with respect to rate of wages paid will be adhered to; third, the facility will be used as a medical library for at least 20 years; and fourth, that sufficient non-Federal funds are available to meet that share of construction costs and maintain the facility once it is operational. Priority is to be granted to applications for which the need is greatest. The Federal grant may equal 75 percent of construction costs. If the facility is not used as a medical library for 20 years, the Federal Government may recover its share of the project. An appropriation of \$10 million for each of the next 4 fiscal years, beginning July 1, 1966, is authorized.

Section 394 covers grants for training in medical library sciences. One million dollars is authorized for fiscal 1966 and each of the following 4 years, through June 30, 1970. Four types of grants are provided: First, to individuals for traineeships and fellowships leading to graduate degrees in the field of medical library science and related fields; second, to individuals who are librarians, to enable them to take courses necessary to obtain greater competence; third, to assist institutions in developing medical librarian training programs; and fourth, to assist in establishing internship programs in medical libraries.

Section 395 covers assistance to special scientific projects. Five hundred thousand dollars is authorized for each year in the 5-year period beginning July 1, 1965. The Surgeon General will use such sums to award fellowships to physicians and other practitioners in the sciences related to health, and scientists, for writing of original medical works, on the compilation of such works.

Section 396 covers research and development in medical library science. The section authorizes \$3 million for each fiscal year in the 5-year period ending June 30, 1970, to be used by the Surgeon General in making grants to public or nonprofit institutions to carry out research projects in the field of medical library science and for the development of new methods and equipment for library operation.

Section 397 covers grants for improving and expanding the basic resources of medical libraries. The section authorizes \$3 million for each fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, such sums to be used by the Surgeon General for grants to public or nonprofit medical libraries to improve their resources. No one library may receive more than \$200,000 in any one year. Grants will be based on the annual operating expenses of the library or the amount of the grant in the preceding year.

Section 398 covers grants for establishment of regional medical libraries.

The section authorizes \$2.5 million for each of the 5 fiscal years ending on June 30, 1970. Such sums to be used by the Surgeon General—with the advice of the Board—to make grants to public or nonprofit medical libraries to enable them to serve as regional libraries. Grants are to be used to acquire library materials, catalog materials, acquisition of duplicating and other machinery to make material more available, and construction and renovation of existing facilities. Grants under this section are available only to libraries that agree to increase their library resources to become regional in nature. Those libraries having the greatest potential as regional libraries are to be given priority. Construction grants made under this section will be governed by the same conditions required under section 393. Grants to purchase basic resource materials may not exceed 50 percent of the library's annual operating expense.

Section 399 covers financial support of biomedical scientific publications. The section authorizes \$1 million for each fiscal year beginning July 1, 1965 and ending June 30, 1970, such sums to be used by the Surgeon General to make grants to public or nonprofit institutions of higher learning and individual scientists for the purpose of supporting biomedical scientific publications and to procure the compilation and writing of reviews, abstracts and bibliographies pertaining to such scientific works. No publication may receive grants supporting it for more than 3 years.

All funds appropriated in any year for any program in this bill shall remain available for use in the future for the same purpose for which it was appropriated.

Section 378 authorizes the Surgeon General to establish as a branch of the National Library of Medicine, a regional medical library to serve the needs of an area when he determines that the area has not a medical library adequate to serve it. Two million dollars per year for each fiscal year—5—through June 30, 1970, is authorized to establish branches of the National Library of

Medicine. Moneys appropriated would remain available until expended.

The compensation paid members of the Board of Regents of the National Library of Medicine is increased from \$50 to \$75 per day.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the rule.

If I may at this time, I should like to pay my commendation and tribute to the gentleman from Arkansas, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I rather imagine that this may be the last important bill he will be presenting to us.

Over the years on the Rules Committee, when I have had the opportunity to listen to him, he has made his presentations in a very able, extremely knowledgeable, and fair manner.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I am delighted that the gentleman has said this, because in all my years in the House of Representatives no Member has better managed the bills which have come from his committee than the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas.

His departure is going to be a terrific loss to the House. He is a great American, a great Congressman, and a magnificent chairman of one of the great committees of the House.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished majority floor leader. May I say to you, Mr. HARRIS, that your district, your State of Arkansas, and the United States of America have had the privilege and the opportunity of having a very fine statesman serving them over the years. I will miss you and your presentations. You are extremely able. I think you are more than justified in your new appointment. I wish you godspeed and in your next job as a Federal court judge I know you will make a very excellent record.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the gentleman from California in pointing out the very outstanding service of the retiring chairman of this rather controversial committee. He has done a magnificent job of presenting bills to this House. The only thing I can say to him is Godspeed. If I ever come before the distinguished gentleman as a judge, I do not want justice; I just want mercy.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I will be very happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. I want to say as ranking Member of the minority that we will greatly miss the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas, the chairman of this committee. We are happy that he is getting the job that he has chosen to finish his career in as a U.S. circuit court judge. That job he is well qualified for. I am sure he will serve in it

with the same kind of distinction and integrity that he has shown as a member of and as chairman of this committee during the 14 years that I have been a Member. I will say that this committee will miss him, because in all my experience in politics I have never known a person who had the ability to bring people together so well. This is a rare quality, may I say, in people generally and even a rarer one in this body. In many instances where it seemed to me there was a dead impasse and where legislation could not move he has been able through his courage, his tenacity, and his discretion to bring the people of diverse opinions together. This I think is the outstanding trait that this gentleman has exhibited to me on this committee. I will admit that with all of this he has a very high degree of integrity and purpose in what he undertakes. To me this is a sign of a person with a great deal of character. I am happy to say this about the distinguished gentleman. I know on some occasions we will see him back in this body. I think as the President said at the White House the other day when he signed the rapid transit bill, he was hoping through this means that he would be able to get the distinguished chairman back here to see him once in awhile and that he would be able to get to Arkansas faster so as to see the distinguished chairman.

So, in whatever capacity he may serve, I think we can say that this has been a great and long period of service in the public interest.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. As a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I certainly want to join in the tribute to this great man. He is one of the finest and most capable persons I have ever known. I wish him well.

I do want to say on this particular bill that it is a good bill.

We all should be interested in it and give it our support. We have supported legislation to improve the health of this Nation. This bill is a vital part of the needs that must be met to make our citizenry healthy. I am sure the House will overwhelmingly approve it. So I hope the rule will be adopted and the bill will be passed.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time. I will say to the gentleman from Texas that I have no requests for time.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure and privilege to yield such time as he may require to the distinguished Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, 24 years ago last January—it will be 25 years ago next January—the people of the Fourth Congressional District of Arkansas sent to the halls of Congress our distinguished friend and colleague, OREN HARRIS. The people of that district are justified in feeling proud of the

distinguished service that he has rendered in the halls of Congress, representing them not only in an honorable and trustworthy manner but in a most constructive and outstanding manner.

OREN HARRIS was elected by the people of the Fourth Congressional District during the past 25 years, but he has grown in stature year after year until years ago—not today, but years ago and today—his name was recognized throughout the entire Nation as one of the ablest and most constructive legislators who has served in the Congress of the United States.

We all regret that he is leaving us. But we know that in the new service that he will perform the judiciary branch of the Government will receive added strength, stature, and dignity.

Mr. Speaker, OREN HARRIS is possessed of a fine judicial mind. With the years of experience he has had in the Congress of the United States, with his profound knowledge of the law, he will be a decided strength to the judiciary of the United States. In addition to ability and character and a sense of honor, to me one of the great traits of a judge is his understanding mind. One of the most unpleasant things for members of the bar to undergo is to know that they are going into a courtroom where the judge is a dictator, where the judge is arbitrary. No matter how brilliant a judge may be, if he is a dictator, if he is arbitrary, he is failing in the performance of the great trust which has been given him.

In OREN HARRIS the judiciary of the United States will receive a man of understanding mind.

Mr. Speaker, I have been a lawyer for many years. I have not practiced for some years because of my duties, but before I came to the halls of Congress I was a very active trial lawyer both in the civil and criminal sides of the court. The best judgment a judge can get is the commendation of those who practice law in his court. When that judge has the commendation and approval and the high regard of members of the bar—and I know I am talking to some Members here, like myself, who are lawyers—that is one of the finest commendations any judge can receive.

OREN HARRIS will be a great judge, not only because of his judicial knowledge and his experience, but because of his understanding mind and his realization that the great powers possessed by a judge should be used as humbly as possible. I know that he will do so.

The House of Representatives and the Congress itself are losing by the appointment of our friend to the judiciary. The U.S. courts will get one of our outstanding Members.

Anyone knows that and everyone admits it. When OREN HARRIS is handling a bill on the floor of the House, the leadership on both sides, having such profound respect for him, do not worry. Speaking for myself on the Democratic side, I do not worry.

But, Mr. Speaker, more than that, he is a good man. In my opinion that is the finest compliment anyone can pay me. I am highly grateful if people think

I am great and good. But if they did not think I was both, I had rather be characterized as being a good man than a great man.

Mr. Speaker, in OREN HARRIS we have both those wonderful qualities that in my opinion make up as beautiful mind as anyone can possess from the human angle, a mind of nobility of character, of dedication to duty and to trust.

OREN, you will always be with us because you served with us. There will be a gap here upon your leaving. However, we have to go on. But we are going to miss you very much and in missing you we know that you are going to add, as I have heretofore said, strength and dignity and prestige to the Federal courts of the United States.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I desire to associate myself with your remarks, as well as those of our leader, relative to our beloved and able colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas the Honorable OREN HARRIS. I would only add that OREN HARRIS is to me best described as a Congressman's Congressman—and no greater tribute can I pay. Our loss here is the judiciary's gain and he will make a great and able Federal judge.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the resolution. The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WELCOMING HIS HOLINESS POPE PAUL VI TO THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN].

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution which is at the Clerk's desk and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. Res. 601

Resolved, That the House of Representatives extends the greetings of the people of the United States to His Holiness, Pope Paul VI, on the occasion of his historic visit to our country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan for 1 minute.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, Monday, October 4, will be an important day in the history of the United States, indeed in the history of the world. For on that day His Holiness, Pope Paul VI, will visit our country and will be the guest of the United Nations in New York.

Mr. Speaker, it is altogether fitting that the House of Representatives should take note of this historic occasion.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of a Protestant church, I am very pleased to join

with all Americans, of all religious faiths, in welcoming His Holiness to our country, and through this resolution to extend to him the warm greetings of the people of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] for 1 minute.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Jewish faith, I too want to join my colleague of the Protestant faith in extending the greetings of the House of Representatives to His Holiness, Pope Paul VI.

Mr. Speaker, to me it is a singularly happy circumstance that his visit to our country will take place during the Jewish Holy Days period.

I am not unmindful of the efforts of His Holiness in seeking to put an end to the attitudes and practices of anti-Semitism from which my own people have suffered for almost 2,000 years.

I extend my thanks to Pope Paul for his enlightened position.

I admire him and wish for him a long life in order that he may further his great efforts for peace in the land.

May he have a very pleasant sojourn in the United States.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have until midnight Saturday night to file a report on the bill H.R. 706.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMENDING PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT TO PROVIDE GRANTS TO ASSIST IN MEETING NEEDS FOR LIBRARY SERVICES AND FACILITIES

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3142) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a program of grants to assist in meeting the need for adequate medical library services and facilities.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3142, with Mr. WELTNER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, first I should like to express my heartfelt thanks and deep

appreciation to our great and distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], whom I have had the honor and privilege to serve with and to work with for almost 25 years. I also want to express my most sincere appreciation to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT]. Also to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH], of the Committee on Rules, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG], of the Committee on Rules, and to the distinguished members of our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and to the Members of the House for their warm and generous comments this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, to say that I have a heavy swelling in my bosom would be putting it mildly.

Mr. Chairman, though we have other bills before our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that have been heard and are being considered, this bill that we bring to the House today is the last of the major important administration bills that have been requested by our great President which have been referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for our consideration.

I want at this time to express my deep and warm feeling for, and deep appreciation of, the members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for their devotion, loyalty, hard work, and understanding in connection with the tremendous responsibilities that we have had. Throughout the last 9 years it has been my privilege and my great honor to have served as chairman of this great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It was just 9 years ago this month that our esteemed and beloved friend and colleague, the late J. Percy Priest, passed on to his reward leaving a legacy to those of us who remained on the committee and to this House of Representatives that will ever remain with us.

Since that time it has been my honor and privilege to have worked with the finest group of the Members of this great Congress of the United States as anyone could be privileged to work with. This has been a rich and rewarding experience to me that I shall always carry in my bosom, and I shall always remember it as the most pleasant experience in my life.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. In order that I may have the privilege of expressing with all of my colleagues my esteem and affection for the able and distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend my remarks in the body of the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank my colleague from the bottom of my heart.

Mr. Chairman, it will probably be the first of the year before I leave. I do not

know precisely when I shall, with mixed feelings, leave this House.

I am happy to bring to the House today with the other Members of the committee a bill that is widely and generally accepted and supported, not only by our committee, but by those throughout the United States who are knowledgeable and interested in this particular field.

I am happy today to bring with my colleagues on the committee a bill designed to improve the communication of health information.

Members might ask, "What does the bill do?" If Members will read the report, Report No. 1026, accompanying the bill H.R. 3142, they will find on page 3 the appropriation authorizations to carry out the Medical Library Assistance Act of 1965. There is a total authorization of \$105 million. There is a total of \$13 million for this fiscal year 1966, and \$23 million for each of the 4 succeeding years.

The bill provides for the construction of medical library facilities, the training of biomedical librarians and information specialists, special scientific projects, research and development in medical library science, and related fields, the improvement and expanding of basic resources of medical libraries, the support of biomedical publications, regional medical libraries, and the establishment of regional branches of the National Library of Medicine.

Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned earlier, the bill we are considering today is designed to improve the communication of health information. This is a serious and urgent problem in our country since the medical libraries which serve this function are no longer able to meet national needs. It has been an unusual experience to be associated with this bill, Mr. Chairman, in that there has been no opposition to it from any quarter. There is a complete consensus in the library and medical professional communities concerned that it is a good bill which will stop further deterioration of this important resource.

The key to the communication of health information is the biomedical library. These libraries are multipurpose institutions. They serve the objectives of health science research, of graduate, undergraduate, and continuing education of the health professions, and the practice of these professions. They acquire, organize, store, and service published information for all these purposes.

The health science libraries of the country are in serious trouble, Mr. Chairman. We are investing large sums of money in programs of research, education, and health services without making the findings available to those who need the information. Unless the medical research scientists and physicians have available complete and up-to-the-minute information on new medical discoveries and practices, progress in the understanding of disease and disability will be slowed. Unless the practicing physician has the latest and best information on diagnosis, treatment, and rehabilitation, the well-being of the patient may be at stake. Unless our students in the health professions have adequate li-

brary facilities available to them during their education, the quality of their training may be adversely affected, and the consequences serious and far reaching.

During a period of intensive development of health research institutions, medical schools, and other medical facilities, support for medical libraries has been seriously neglected. The condition of medical libraries has steadily deteriorated under the pressures of rapid development of other programs and activities of medical institutions, most of which are making increasing demands upon the medical library. As early as 1950, a major survey of medical education called this situation critical.

In addition, the broadening base of medical research and practice, calling for literature from many other fields, has added to the magnitude and complexity of medical literature. Medical libraries are cramped for space, deficient in trained manpower, inadequate in resources, and desperately in need of new methods for handling the growing medical literature.

A large-scale national effort is needed now to rehabilitate medical libraries. Unless such an effort is mounted, the large investments we have made in programs of health service and research will be placed in jeopardy through the failure of our health communications systems.

For several years now, many distinguished groups, including the National Advisory Health Council, the presidentially appointed Board of Regents of the National Library of Medicine, and the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke have recommended to the Surgeon General that the Public Health Service seek the necessary authority and resources for its National Library of Medicine to develop a program of assistance to health science libraries. The Medical Library Assistance Act, as amended by our committee, contains the legislative authority needed to accomplish this end.

The bill would authorize grants-in-aid of up to 75 percent of the costs of constructing, renovating, expanding, or remodeling biomedical library facilities. This section of the bill is directed at one of the most serious problems of the libraries. More than 50 percent of all medical school libraries were constructed more than 30 years ago, long before the publication explosion was anticipated or felt. The Association of American Medical Colleges has conducted a survey of the medical libraries of its member schools to determine what their needs might be. They found that at the present time the average medical school library occupies about 18,000 square feet. This is less than one-half the amount of space required to operate a modern medical library. In many libraries there is crowding to the point that routine day-to-day activities are impeded, access to materials is made difficult or impossible, and the utilization of the libraries by scientific and medical personnel and students is inhibited.

However, since the technology of library science has shared in the techno-

logical revolution of the last few decades, the implementation of the construction program should be preceded by a careful study of the kinds of facilities which will be best suited to meeting present and future requirements in the light of these rapid technological developments. We have taken account of the need for this study by delaying the first appropriation authorization under this section until fiscal year 1967. We have also amended this section to require the use of facilities constructed as health science libraries for periods of 20 years following completion. This follows the provision of the Hill-Burton hospital construction program.

The contribution that health science libraries can make to the advancement of medical knowledge and medical service is directly related to the caliber and number of people who staff them. There is a great deficit of professionally trained manpower in this field.

The bill would authorize the Surgeon General to make grants to assist in the training of medical librarians and other information specialists in the health sciences. Today it is essential that the personnel responsible for the operation and future planning of the medical libraries have special training in medical librarianship. This training should be related to the specialized communication problems of the medical community. Medical librarians must be well grounded in the biomedical sciences, and they must be thoroughly familiar with the design of technical information systems. Many of those presently staffing health sciences libraries are in need of intensive specialized training in order to increase and update their competence. The urgency to begin action programs in this area cannot be overstated.

The requirements of health sciences libraries for books, journals, and other informational resources is of such magnitude and so directly related to medical research, to the training of professional health manpower, and the information essential to the practicing community as to require special, intense attention immediately if our fundamental responsibilities for a healthy nation are to be fulfilled. In a study made in 1963, it was found that only 14 of the 87 existing medical schools met the standards for the number of volumes which should be in medical school libraries. Published information is of little value unless it is available to those who need it when they need it.

Two sections of the bill are directed at making more and better resources available to local biomedical libraries. One of these would authorize the Public Health Service to make grants on a matching basis to expand and improve basic biomedical library and related resources. These grants would be limited to 5 years for any institution and would decrease each year. The other section of the bill is designed to increase the availability of books, journals, and other informational material to local libraries through the support of regional libraries. Grants under this section would be made to major health science libraries which

would agree to provide supportive services to other libraries in the region. These grants would be made to qualifying existing biomedical libraries. Where there are areas of the country in which there are no existing health science libraries of sufficient strength to serve a regional community, the bill authorizes the establishment of branches of the National Library of Medicine. The need for this regional service has become acute with the growth in the size of the medical literature and with the need for increased speed of access to it.

Presently the National Library of Medicine is serving as the "libraries' library" in meeting the requirements for increasing amounts of material which local medical libraries do not have on their shelves. This function of the National Library of Medicine has reached such great proportions as to make mandatory the assumption of a part of the responsibility elsewhere. Regional health science resource libraries, in lending such assistance to the local libraries, would help materially in solving this problem, while taking account of the fact that it is neither economically feasible nor necessary for each biomedical library to try to build its collection to encompass the whole of the biomedical literature. Such a program would also serve to prevent the growth of a highly centralized, monolithic system of library service which could not be as responsive to local needs as could a decentralized system.

Many of the tools and methods used today to operate health science libraries are hopelessly inadequate. Research and development is required to devise new and more efficient techniques to deal with biomedical information requirements. The bill would authorize the award of grants and contracts to accomplish this.

The bill would authorize a program of grants and contracts for support of non-profit, scientific publications and to procure the preparation and publication of reviews, abstracts, indexes, handbooks, bibliographies, and other forms of secondary publications. Effective access to the medical literature requires a variety of these forms of publications. This is particularly true now that the biomedical literature is so complex and voluminous. The bill, as introduced, authorized an appropriation of up to \$1.5 million for this activity. The committee believed that \$1 million was sufficient authorization and so amended it.

The increase in complexity and volume of the literature has given rise to the need for a program of support for individual scholars for the preparation of critical reviews and similar compilations of original contributions of a high degree of excellence and reliability. These works are needed to make more readily available to the biomedical community knowledge of advances in the health sciences which have been carefully evaluated and interpreted by experts in the particular field. The bill would authorize a program of grants to scholars in the medical sciences to accomplish these ends.

All sections of H.R. 3142 are interrelated and together constitute a comprehensive plan which can effectively

remedy the effects of many years of neglect, maximize the resources, functions, and services which do exist, and bring biomedical library practice and facilities to the frontiers of knowledge and capability, both theoretical and practical, in this field. The existing informal health science library network is a logical base upon which to build our overall effort to improve and perfect a health information system. Medical libraries are the instruments which our society has devised for the purposes of preserving accurately the information which has already been uncovered and of making it available to those who need it in the interest of health research, service, or professional education. A well-developed program of assistance to them is necessary and timely.

In summary, the case for this bill can be stated briefly under four headings:

First. Programs of education, research, and service in medicine and health-related fields will be effective only if supported by adequate library and information services.

Second. Medical library resources and services are not now adequate to the needs of the research community.

Third. The gap between present levels of support and adequacy is too large to be closed quickly if at all from nongovernmental sources.

Fourth. The program set forth in H.R. 3142 is soundly conceived and would achieve a dramatic and balanced development of medical library resources.

The committee believes that this bill will receive enthusiastic endorsement from the Congress and the administration, as it has from the public and professional societies who are deeply concerned with our Nation's health.

This is a good program. It has wide support and advocacy. We urge its unanimous adoption by the Congress.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

This session of Congress should go down in history as the "health session." Certainly it has considered and passed more important, far-reaching and expensive health legislation than any previous session and probably more than any previous Congress. Most of this legislation was timely and desirable.

Today we are considering what I believe to be and certainly hope is the last of that long list of health legislation—the Medical Library Assistance Act. Coming as it does at the end of the list it seems likely that anything said about it will sound like the replay of an old record. The phrases and the adjectives used in presenting health legislation have been worn to a frazzle. I do not blame anyone who sighs and says, "Here we go again." That, however, is unfortunate because this particular bill could well have qualified to head the list of such legislation, rather than be dragged in as tail-end Charlie. It could be said with justification that if no other health bill had been considered this one would be too worthwhile to ignore. Let us see why.

First of all, every panel of experts and advisers gathered together to consider national health problems in the last few

years—there have been four major groups of this kind—have recommended assistance to medical libraries. They have, in fact, indicated that most other plans for health programs will realize but little unless medical libraries are improved. The basic recommendations of the various groups have been the same. In addition to the unanimity of opinion among advisory groups, the voluntary health organizations, the medical fraternity and the research community have also been of one mind on the subject. And these agencies and professional groups have been working hard to bring about improvement in the facilities now extant. Some notable progress has been made.

Scientific knowledge is growing and accumulating faster than present space and personnel, or even presently projected facilities can hope to accommodate it. We spend in the billions to acquire new and useful information and techniques to combat disease, only to have it languish for lack of dissemination. It becomes more and more unlikely that a doctor can more than vaguely hear about scientific breakthrough. The space, the equipment, and the proper trained personnel are just not available to make it conveniently accessible. Without going at length into the statistics on shortage of volumes and floorspace it can be said, on all the evidence, that a major effort is necessary, just to catch up and be in some reasonable position to keep up. In short, medical library facilities must be able to get hold of the information that exists, must be able to handle it properly and must be ready to handle far more in the future. To do this they will need more room, more material, more and better equipment and far more trained people.

These are separate but related problems to be solved in this regard as the situation readily indicates. This bill takes them all into consideration and tries to make at least a start on each so that the effort is coordinated.

First, there are grants for construction. Medical schools already have plans for \$87 million worth of medical library construction which they cannot carry out without some help. To get these going, the bill provides for \$10 million per year for 4 years to cover up to 75 percent of the cost. Such a sum does not even cut their problem in half because the above figure does not take into account other kinds of health institutions which will also need facilities. Other construction may also be assisted if its purpose is to establish a regional library and the National Library of Medicine may establish one branch library.

Next, there must be assistance in acquiring the usable content of such a library. The programs outlined in the bill take into account the basic needs of individual, localized libraries, but also the special needs of regional libraries which will be expected easily to make available requested items from the great reservoir of scientific information.

The one other indispensable ingredient in this program is the provision for graduate traineeships in medical library science. Apparently it requires very spe-

cialized training to run properly a library of this kind. There are half as many trained persons today as there are medical libraries. Even if we concede that some small facilities can do without a highly educated specialist we can readily see that even the installations at existing medical schools, particularly those which will serve as regional libraries, will require more and better people.

There are other provisions in this bill which no doubt will prove useful in complete fulfillment of the objective. Grants for research in medical library science make sense. Better methods for handling the ever-increasing volume of scientific material must be discovered. Grants for professional people to write tracts and those to support scientific publications are not a significant part of this entire program and I have some feeling that they are not absolutely essential. The committee decided to leave them intact and I have no strong feeling which would prompt me to dispute that decision by my colleagues.

As I said earlier, it is unfortunate that this program comes before you at this late date in the session and after so many health bills have been passed. Actually, it is the backbone of the medical progress we so earnestly seek and I feel compelled to recommend it to you upon its merits. May I say that his memorial, if there is one, so far as our committee is concerned, will be the medical and scientific legislation which this committee has produced in the first session of this Congress.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. In the presentation of the rule it was stated that certain funds would be recoverable. What funds are recoverable and who would pay them back to the Federal Government?

Mr. SPRINGER. I will have to refer that question to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. We added provisions to bills of this character where Federal assistance was provided for construction purposes, and so forth, a good many years ago. As a matter of fact what is now known as the Hill-Burton Act has a recovery provision in it, as have innumerable bills passed since then. So, to carry out what has worked out to be a very good policy and principle, we provide under this bill, that in order to protect the interests of the Federal Government, under certain conditions the Surgeon General may recover the funds.

Mr. GROSS. What is the source of the income that would make it possible to repay these funds?

Mr. HARRIS. It would be the building itself. As an example, take a building used as a medical library, if community X or institution Y decided that they did not want to use it any longer for a medical library then the bill provides that the United States may attach the building and see what we can do to recover the funds the United States is entitled to in that fashion.

Mr. GROSS. But otherwise there would be no recovery; is that about correct?

Mr. HARRIS. That is true.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman, and I wish to commend the committee for the provision in the bill which gives the Comptroller General authority to audit the books and records pertinent to any grant received under the act.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding. I should like to state that he and the distinguished chairman of the committee, my neighbor from the Southern State of Arkansas, just south of my hometown, have brought to the floor today a bill that, as one of the doctors in the House, I know something about medical schools, and particularly libraries, going back as far as the libraries that were established by Dr. Benjamin Rush, one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, and for whom the school from which I graduated was named. They have had a most difficult time, even those that have the ancient volumes and the true treatises of the original bedside and laboratory discoveries in medicine.

I think if indeed we are to spend money we ought to spend it domestically to improve our own lot. Personally I think we should pursue it and pursue the Muses and scientific research along with the arts and the humanities that we voted in this House in the past month.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman. I appreciate what he has said in support of the bill.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, knowing the concern which the distinguished gentleman from Missouri has had for the cost of the programs and how carefully he has tried to guard the budget and the appropriations during the time he has been in the Congress, this is indeed a tribute for him to support this worthwhile legislation and to say that it deserves the support of the House. I thank him for it.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me, and I want to say that I urge the passage of this legislation. It has been thoroughly gone into and deserves the approval of the Members of the House.

Mr. Chairman, if this country is to gainfully use the vast information which our researchers and scientists are producing in the medical field, the Medical Library Assistance Act of 1965 must be enacted into law.

This bill recognizes the vast deficiencies existing in the dissemination of research knowledge to individuals who must use this knowledge. A recent survey has shown that the medical libraries of this country are woefully inadequate to handle this task. Ten million dollars per year has been allocated under this bill to assist in the construction of medi-

cal libraries. The committee has reason to believe that the great bulk of this money will be used for construction of new facilities rather than remodeling of old. This is due to the lack of recent construction in the medical library field.

It is not enough that we construct the facilities, we must assist training programs in medical library sciences. Under the bill, traineeships and fellowships in graduate library science work will be provided. These grants will enable our library technicians to keep pace with the new methods and procedures of information dissemination.

In view of the increased demands which have been placed on the National Library of Medicine, the bill also authorizes the establishment of regional medical libraries. These libraries will insure that all areas of our Nation will have ready access to the medical information so necessary to the adequate practice and research individuals will be carrying on.

The bill will also provide for grants of assistance to special scientific projects which will aid in the compilation of existing contributions in the scientific field. Grants will also be made available for the acquisition of books, journals, photographs, cataloging and binding of materials and the acquisition of duplication devices and audiovisual aids.

The Surgeon General is also authorized to establish a regional branch of the National Library of Medicine in an area in which no regional medical library is adequately meeting the communities needs.

These provisions, Mr. Chairman, will go a long way toward alleviating the deficiencies and shortages we now face in this area. It is my hope that the House will see fit to approve this legislation.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to yield at this time 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, first I want to join with others in paying my respects to the chairman of the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], and for the constructive work that he has done, as well as the pattern that he has laid for those of us who have the privilege of heading committees in the operation and conduct of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, it has been my privilege to work rather closely with the gentleman, because the Committee on Science and Astronautics has an interest in many fields amongst which are fields in which the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is concerned. There are great gray areas in which we work together.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to say that during this period of time that the Science and Astronautics Committee has been in operation, we have never been in conflict with the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The gentleman from Arkansas has been most knowing and understanding in this matter. It is because I am interested in science, and the committee that I have

the privilege to head, its responsibility is for science in this country, that I want to support wholeheartedly this legislation and to recommend it to the Members of the Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I just asked a member of the staff of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce about how much money we spend through the National Institutes of Health each year in research into certain fields of human illnesses, the cardiac, mental health, dental health, and so forth, and he tells me it is in excess of \$1 billion a year. For why and for what purpose do we spend this money? So that we can gain information and knowledge which can be used to relieve suffering among the people of the country. But what good does it do us unless it is disseminated and made available to those practitioners who use it for the good of humanity?

So, Mr. Chairman, the work is only half done in the research laboratory, unless we arrange to make the knowledge gained there available to the physicians and those practitioners engaged in the healing arts covered in the bill who work so successfully in this field.

After all, Mr. Chairman, in the history of this country, it was not so long ago that we quit adding a new pebble to the gourd which the medicine man shook to drive away fevers and the ills of the world. Before us is the great challenge to the medical profession, and I am certain that it will meet this challenge and solve many of these problems through research institutions such as the NIH, the foundations and the universities throughout the country. But above all there will be a medium through which information can be exchanged and information can be made available to those who use it.

Mr. Chairman, that is what this bill does. We are going to be confronted with the same problem in other facets of science today.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman yielding again. I do not want to take the time of the Committee this late in the day, but I think probably the Committee should know—as does the gentleman in the well and certainly the Chairman and the learned member of this Committee—that great steps are being made not only in the automatic typewriter translation of medical reports from all languages from all over the world, but at the National Library of Medicine in the Medlars system, which is a key punch automatic data processing machine which is computerized, through the medium of magnetic tapes, with the dissemination of this material to all people who are interested enough to help themselves in the field of medicine, around the world.

Mr. Chairman, this is a direct outgrowth of what happened during World War II, as I believe that is referred to in the committee report. During that time many of the famous medical libraries around the world were destroyed. It was my privilege at that time to twice

appoint in the name of and for the Surgeon General the librarian of the "Army Medical Library," which later became the National Library of Medicine under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, about which this committee is well advised.

I think this committee was well advised at that time, Mr. Chairman.

I simply want to add they disseminated records and reconstituted the libraries around the world by the use of the microfilm technique which was distributed in order to reconstitute not only periodicals, treatises and scientific research papers, but books which had been destroyed. This is indeed a great means of dissemination of scientific knowledge and I compliment the gentleman from California on what he has so ably said. I also compliment the committee, Mr. Chairman, on specifying and lodging control in the Surgeon General, U.S. Public Health Service, by name throughout this bill.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, in closing I want to say what we are doing here transcends the boundaries even of our country in making this knowledge available to the people of the world for the betterment of all mankind.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to yield at this time to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Hawaii, such time as he may require.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, as one of those who spearheaded the drive to establish the county medical library in Honolulu, Hawaii, I rise in support of H.R. 3142, the Medical Library Assistance Act of 1965.

Recent studies have shown that medical libraries, once established, are not able without support to meet the increasing demands of the medical community and the community at large. In fact, the evidence is both startling and convincing that the condition of medical libraries has deteriorated to such an extent that it is open to serious question as to whether they are properly and adequately serving the medical profession and its supportive services.

One of the principal deficiencies of today's medical libraries is of course the lack of adequate space. Without proper and sufficient physical facilities, the medical library is not able to even begin to render the kind of service that is expected of it. The acquisition of additional volumes and other up-to-date medical literature would be out of the question for a medical library which is bursting at the seams, so to speak, and which does not provide free and easy access to the materials already on hand. Unfortunately, this is the typical situation in which many of our medical libraries of today find themselves.

H.R. 3142 would alleviate this situation by authorizing the Surgeon General to make grants of up to 75 percent of the costs of constructing, renovating, expanding, or remodeling medical library facilities. This would meet a basic critical need in updating our medical libraries.

Providing for the improvement of the physical plant, however, is only a part of the answer to the serious dilemma which confronts our medical libraries. There must also be a proper dissemination of the latest medical and related knowledge through various printed media if our medical libraries are going to serve their basic function. In these times of rapidly advancing medical knowledge and techniques, it is imperative that the latest information relating to the medical sciences be made readily available to the medical community. The failure to do this could pose a very real threat to the health of our people.

In the bill we are now debating we find assurances of increasing the availability of the latest medical knowledge in all of its myriad forms to all users of qualified medical libraries throughout the country. This is a very important consideration in assisting our medical libraries to better serve their particular localities. In this connection, added benefits would be derived from the proposed development of a system of regional medical libraries, locally operated and controlled but with Federal assistance, in the collection of materials in depth.

Finally, to meet the critical shortage of professional personnel trained to meet the special needs of medical libraries and the medical community they serve, H.R. 3142 would authorize a training assistance program which would provide competent staffing of medical libraries.

In these and other phases of the critical medical library situation, the legislation we are considering will provide the necessary remedial steps to bring medical library science to a high level of adequacy and competence.

Mr. Chairman, our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has done a most commendable job on this problem of meeting the need for adequate medical library services and facilities. H.R. 3142 is a tribute to the fine work of the members of the committee and especially to its distinguished chairman, OREN HARRIS.

The result of their labors is worthy of our support and I urge a favorable vote for H.R. 3142.

Before I relinquish the floor, Mr. Chairman, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. OREN HARRIS is unquestionably one of the most effective Members of this body and of the Congress. There are many laws and programs which will long stand as a monument to this great legislator and statesman. What is even more important from my point of view is that in OREN HARRIS I found, as a freshman Member of this body during my first term, a warm and understanding friend. He was never too busy to lend a helping hand, even to a lowly freshman, and always willingly and with a smile. I shall long cherish his many acts of kindness and wise counsel. My life as a Congressman has been enriched for having known OREN HARRIS, and I want to be included among those who will be missing him dearly and wishing him the best of everything when he leaves these

Halls to take his place on the judiciary bench.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in support of H.R. 3142—the Medical Library Assistance Act of 1965, which is designed to provide for a program of grants to assist in meeting the need for adequate medical library services and facilities.

Mr. Chairman, in January I introduced a bill—H.R. 6001—with this same objective. At that time I reminded the Members of this House that the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke had found that the present state of medical libraries in the United States was lamentable. Further, I reminded you that the Commission had warned that "unless major attention is directed to improvement of our national medical library base, the continued and accelerated generation of scientific knowledge will become increasingly an exercise in futility."

This warning was as serious as it was overdue. It is a tragic commentary on our national planning that—in making our Nation's medical libraries the poor stepchildren of our Nation's medical research effort—we have not spent the comparatively small amount of money needed to enable our medical libraries to serve as communication centers for health science information.

I say "comparatively small amount of money." To put the matter in proper perspective in dollar terms—and this is important, whenever we consider a bill before this House—let me cite comparative costs.

If we talk only of Federal support for biomedical research—an area with which I have had some familiarity over the past two decades—the Federal Government is spending well over \$1 billion today, in that great war on disease. Yet, last year, out of that \$1 billion provided from Federal funds, less than \$1 million could, under existing legislative authorities, accrue to the benefit of non-Government medical libraries. The Federal Government is simply not paying its share of the Nation's costs of medical communication.

To remedy this, the President's Commission recommended a 5-year \$160 million program of aid for our medical libraries. The bill we have before us today—designed to implement the recommendations of the Commission—provides \$105 million over a 5-year period. This is a modest start and it is hedged about with a number of excellent amendments added to the measure by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

With the practical attention to detail that so often distinguishes his committee hearings, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] has reported out the bill we are considering with three amendments that are wise safeguards. One of these provides that, where construction assistance is provided under this legislation, the facility constructed must continue to be used for the purposes for which constructed for at least 20 years—instead of the 10 years provided for in the introduced bill. This amendment is consistent with the recapture provisions

of the Hill-Burton hospital construction program.

Another provision deletes a proposed \$10 million authorization for appropriations for the current fiscal year—the committee feeling that the proposed plans for construction would not have progressed sufficiently to warrant appropriations for the current fiscal year.

Finally, the committee reduced from \$1.5 to \$1 million the amounts which may be utilized for grants for financial support of scientific publications. In this, I understand that it is the intention of the committee to limit the authority of this section—section 399—to writing which is incidental to the primary function of the publication involved. This amendment is tied in with another section—section 395—and reflects the sound judgment of the committee.

I will not review all the details of the Medical Library Assistance Act of 1965, but I would like to summarize its major provisions to emphasize in specific terms how this measure will benefit the health of the American people. The measure would provide: first, funds for the construction of facilities; second, grants for training in medical library information science; third, assistance to special scientific projects, such as studies in the history of medicine; fourth, research and development in medical library science and related fields; fifth, grants for improving and expanding the basic resources of medical libraries and related instrumentalities; sixth, grants for the establishment of regional medical libraries; seventh, establishment of regional branches of the National Library of Medicine; and, eighth, financial support of biomedical scientific publications.

Mr. Chairman, I had the privilege of testifying in behalf of this measure when committee hearings were held. At that time I commented that a weak and inefficient medical library system results in a wastage of our medical research resources that is unnecessary and of such magnitude that it can no longer be disregarded. Unplanned and unnecessary duplication of research costs time and money, and research results that are reported but cannot be retrieved might as well never have been reported. Someone else will have to duplicate them and report them again before they can help one other scientist or be used by one practitioner to alleviate the sufferings of even one patient.

The irony of this—I said—is that our success in creating and sustaining a national effort in biomedical research over the past two decades has produced a flow of new medical information the like of which has never been seen before in human history. But this flow of information has turned into a flood and swamped the reservoirs—the Nation's medical libraries are the inevitable reservoirs of this new knowledge. The flooding—the information that has seeped away or has been lost down the spillways—is a tragic thing to watch.

Mr. Chairman, I think that it is this spectacle that has brought about a general recognition that we must act quickly to meet a grave situation. In the course of my years in dealing with health legis-

lation, I cannot recall a health measure that has had more unanimous support than the Medical Library Assistance Act of 1965.

I am informed that when hearings were held on this bill, all the witnesses—there was no exception—testified in favor of this bill. It has not only the support of those directly concerned—the Medical Library Association, the Special Libraries Association, the Association of Research Libraries, the Association of American Medical Colleges. It also has the support of the voluntary health agencies—such as the American Heart Association—and of the professional organizations such as the American Dental Association, the American Public Health Association, the American Optometric Association, and the American Medical Association.

There can be only one explanation for this extraordinary unanimity of support. The medical libraries of this Nation are in a disgraceful condition—the victims of a criminal neglect.

Despite other programs of support for the construction of health-related facilities, medical libraries have never received an adequate share of assistance. A recent survey of 116 established medical, dental, osteopathic, and public health schools show that 86 of their libraries were in need of funds for construction of new facilities and 18 needed funds for renovation of their library quarters.

Under the terms of the Medical Library Assistance Act, a program of matching grants up to 75 percent of the costs of construction may be made for the construction of medical libraries over the years 1967-70, at the rate of \$10 million a year.

Despite other programs for the support of health-related training, real Federal support for training in the library sciences is yet to come. The manpower problem in the Nation's biomedical libraries is perhaps the most serious of all their problems. Because of lack of manpower, failures in transmitting the medical knowledge already available in the published literature to the physicians of this country can have a direct and grave impact on the health care of our citizens. Yet—faced as our librarians are with ever-increasing demands on their time—less than 50 new medical librarians are being added to the manpower pool each year. This can only mean a further deterioration in our present library services.

Under the terms of the Medical Library Assistance Act, between 125 and 150 new personnel can be added annually, with about 750 information personnel being trained during the 5 years of this proposed program.

When you recall that we have 6,000 libraries in this country, but only 3,000 librarians, the significance of even this small increase is apparent.

Finally, I would like to say that, now that the needs of our medical libraries are at last to be given some attention, the National Library of Medicine has wisely been selected as the agency best qualified to provide the kind of leadership called for in this area. A system

of regional medical libraries—locally operated and controlled—are to be developed, and if in some region of this Nation there is not now some medical library adequate to serve area needs, regional libraries may be established as branches of the National Library of Medicine. With its international reputation and its vast experience in providing library services in the medical area, the NLM is prepared to take the initiative in helping the various regions of this Nation assume their medical library roles in assuring fast and accurate library services.

Mr. Chairman and Members of this Committee, this 89th Congress has passed a record number of legislative measures which are intended to bring to the service of more people than ever before the health-giving, life-saving accomplishments flowing from our Nation's laboratories.

But it is the Nation's libraries that must receive this flow of information, and it is these libraries which our Nation's physicians must use to learn of newer methods for the treatment or prevention of illness and suffering. The deplorable neglect of our medical libraries is so widely recognized now—the testimony in support of medical library assistance is so unanimous—that this House cannot in conscience fail to approve this carefully considered bill we are now discussing. Lives are being lost which might be saved. This is happening all across this land, today. By giving our support to the Medical Library Assistance Act of 1965, we will help assure that it cannot happen, tomorrow.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I want to join my colleagues in paying tribute to OREN HARRIS, our distinguished chairman. He has been a source of strength and an inspiration to all of us on the committee. I know he will be as great a judge as he has been a legislator, and as a legislator, he is one of the outstanding Members of the House. In my opinion, OREN HARRIS ranks high among the great men who have served their country in this body throughout its history. We all wish him well in his new field.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today shows the skill and ability of the great chairman of our committee. There is a need in the health field, and he has provided a means for meeting that need. The vehicle he has chosen, H.R. 3142, is strongly supported by all segments of our society affected by it. It came out of our committee unanimously and should, in my opinion, pass the House unanimously.

The bill provides support for new construction of libraries in the sciences related to health. The needs in this area are substantial.

Despite other programs of support for the construction of health-related facilities, medical libraries have failed to receive an adequate measure of assistance. Of 116 established medical, dental, osteopathic, and public health schools surveyed, only 11 had libraries built within the last 5 years.

The average medical school library is currently 18,115 square feet, and the av-

erage desired size of planned, new libraries would be 32,534 square feet. The 1964 education number of the Journal of the American Medical Association indicated the recommended standard for a medical school library was 29,500 square feet. There were only 15 medical school libraries in the country which exceeded this suggested standard.

Known dental school library needs focus on 15 schools requiring construction of an average of 9,797 additional square feet; the present average square footage is far below this at only 1,430 square feet. The suggested standard for a dental school library of 25,000 volumes is 10,000 square feet, with a range from 7,560 to 10,780, depending upon the size of the student body.

Proposed standards and comparative evaluative studies of osteopathic and public health school libraries have not been done, although needs for construction and resources were surveyed and will be summarized below. In contrast, a considerable volume of data is available on nursing school libraries, hospital libraries, and medical society libraries. All of these libraries would be eligible for construction support by definition, although in the case of nursing school and hospital libraries, it is more probable than in other categories that previous legislation can meet their needs; that is, Public Law 88-581, the Nurse Training Act, and Public Law 88-443, the Hill-Burton Act. It is known, however, that hospitals have not always had library needs taken care of under Hill-Burton because of limitation of funds and, therefore, should not be precluded from assistance under this bill.

The total estimated need for construction for medical, dental, osteopathic, public health, optometric, and other schools, both established and new, are almost \$100 million. For this purpose, the bill would authorize appropriations not to exceed \$10 million a year for 4-year period beginning in fiscal year 1967 and would, therefore, represent a significant step toward meeting this critical need.

The bill provides in section 394 for grants for training in medical library sciences. The bill proposes to attack the problems in several interrelated ways. High priority would be given under the bill to the broad support of a highly selective, limited number of centers of excellence which might be located in schools or library science or other professional or graduate schools to establish comprehensive training at the graduate level for individuals desiring advanced training in preparation for careers in medical library science. Special emphasis would be given to the planning of medical information systems and the training environment would draw heavily on various disciplines, particularly the biomedical sciences, and also mathematics, systems engineering, linguistics, and management. Such training activities would be developed in conjunction with strong biomedical resources so that the scholarly research pursued by the graduate students in medical library or information science can be conducted in

the actual environment which they seek ultimately to serve.

It is interesting to note the status of advanced library science training in the past. Between 1925 and 1960, there were only 224 doctoral dissertations, of which 16 were classified as dealing with technical processes and documentation and 7 in methods of research evaluation. None of these was specifically related to a medical subject area.

It is envisioned that under the bill six or seven centers of excellence would be supported utilizing the training grant mechanism which would provide for faculty support as well as stipends for graduate students, including postdoctoral fellows.

In addition to this type of advanced training, H.R. 3142 would encompass medical library internships. The present library graduate from the traditional 5-year programs has rarely had any exposure to a medical library, having had only a course in medical bibliography. The intern is supported for a full year of practical as well as further theoretical instruction. Such internship training would be carried out in some cases in medical school libraries, in others, in large teaching hospital libraries or, in certain instances, in medical society libraries that serve extensive areas of the medical community.

Among other important features of the bill, Mr. Chairman, is the new section 397, providing grants for basic resources of medical libraries.

Funds made available under this section shall be utilized by the Surgeon General for making grants of money, materials, or both, to public or private nonprofit medical libraries and related scientific communication instrumentalities for the purpose of expanding and improving their basic medical library or related resources. There is no doubt that resources support is one of the primary needs in almost every biomedical library and that no other legislation, either existing or proposed, can meet the need in the biomedical field adequately.

The uses for which grants are made for resources may include but are not limited to the acquisition of books, journals, photographs, motion pictures and other films, and other similar materials; cataloging, binding, and other services and procedures for processing library resource materials for use by those who are served by the library or related instrumentality; acquisition of duplication devices, facsimile equipment, film projectors, recording equipment and other equipment to facilitate the use of the resources of the library or related instrumentality by those who are served by it; and the introduction of new technologies in medical librarianship. In awarding such grants, the scope of services to be provided to students, physicians, faculty, and hospital staff will be considered. A formula has been derived through which the Government provides a decreasing percent of the operating budget annually for 5 years. This is designed to, first, make a significant but relatively short term grant to bring basic resources up to a more useful level; and second, to en-

courage increases support to the library by the institution on a continuing basis.

Mr. Chairman, there are other important programs provided under the bill, which others have discussed in some detail, so I shall not go into them further.

In concluding, let me say that this is a very important bill, and is one that I am happy to endorse without reservation.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Hawaii for his very generous and warm compliments.

As I expressed earlier, I am deeply grateful to all the members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for their assistance and cooperation in the splendid work that we have done together. It has been a rich experience in my life. I hope the work that we have accomplished will inure to the best interests of the American people and I believe it will.

I am grateful for the cooperation of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] and all the members of the minority on these innumerable legislative programs that we have considered together and reported out and brought to the House of Representatives for its consideration.

I should also like to state for the record and to the Members of the House that I shall be eternally grateful for the very fine and efficient staff of our committee. I do not believe there is any committee of the Congress now or that there has been in the past, that has had a more devoted, dedicated, loyal, and efficient staff than we have on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

That goes for the professional members of our staff who have been with us, at least some of them, for almost 20 years, and the clerk of our committee and the clerical members of our staff. They have all tried to perform their work in a way that would serve not only the membership of the committee itself but the Congress as a whole and the entire United States. They have done their work courteously and well.

Jim Menger, who has handled the staff work on this bill has been on our staff for a little over 2 years. With his background of legislative experience, having been assigned to the Office of the Legislative Council where he worked for 11 years, he has brought strength to our committee. He has helped to guide us on many of these technical provisions in working out legislative programs so that they would accomplish what was intended to be accomplished by the committee and by the Congress.

I think in the future years that I may be permitted to serve as a judge in the U.S. district court, I will have little difficulty in discerning the intention of the committee and of the Congress when I read the reports that refer to the legislative programs that our committee has reported to the House of Representatives.

I express to them my gratitude and deep appreciation.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time. I suggest that the Clerk read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3142

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Medical Library Assistance Act of 1965".

SEC. 2. Title III of the Public Health Service Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new part:

"PART I—ASSISTANCE TO MEDICAL LIBRARIES

"Declaration of policy and statement of purpose

"SEC. 390. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares that (1) the unprecedented expansion of knowledge in the health sciences within the past two decades has brought about a massive growth in the quantity, and major changes in the nature of, biomedical information, materials, and publications; (2) there has not been a corresponding growth in the facilities and techniques necessary adequately to coordinate and disseminate among health scientists and practitioners the ever increasing volume of knowledge and information which has been developed in the health science field; (3) much of the value of the ever increasing volume of knowledge and information which has been, and continues to be, developed in the health science field will be lost unless proper measures are taken in the immediate future to develop facilities and techniques necessary to collect, preserve, store, process, retrieve, and facilitate the dissemination and utilization of, such knowledge and information.

"(b) It is therefore the policy of this part to—

"(1) assist in the construction of new, and the renovation, expansion, or rehabilitation, of existing medical library facilities;

"(2) assist in the training of medical librarians and other information specialists in the health sciences;

"(3) assist, through the awarding of special fellowships to physicians and scientists, in the compilation of existing, and the creation of additional, written matter which will facilitate the distribution and utilization of knowledge and information relating to scientific, social and cultural advancements in sciences related to health;

"(4) assist in the conduct of research and investigations in the field of medical library science and related activities, and in the development of new techniques, systems and equipment for processing, storing, retrieving, and distributing information in the sciences related to health;

"(5) assist in improving and expanding the basic resources of medical libraries and related facilities;

"(6) assist in the development of a national system of regional medical libraries each of which would have facilities of sufficient depth and scope to supplement the services of other medical libraries within the region served by it; and

"(7) provide financial support to biomedical scientific publications.

"Definitions

"SEC. 391. As used in this part—

"(1) the term 'sciences related to health' includes medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, and public health, and fundamental and applied sciences when related thereto;

"(2) the terms 'National Medical Libraries Assistance Advisory Board' and 'Board' mean the Board of Regents of the National Library of Medicine established under section 373(a) of this Act;

"(3) the terms 'construction' and 'cost of construction', when used with reference to any medical library facility, include (A) the construction of new buildings, and the expansion, remodeling, and alteration of existing buildings, including architects' fees, but

not including the cost of acquisition of land or off-site improvements, and (B) equipping new buildings and existing buildings (whether or not expanded, remodeled, or altered) for use as a library (including provision of automatic data processing equipment), but not with books, pamphlets, or related material;

"National Medical Libraries Assistance Board

"SEC. 392. (a) The Board of Regents of the National Library of Medicine established pursuant to section 373(a) shall, in addition to its functions prescribed under section 373, constitute and serve as the National Medical Libraries Assistance Advisory Board (hereinafter in this part referred to as the 'Board').

"(b) The Board shall—

"(1) advise and assist the Surgeon General in the preparation of general regulations and with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this part, and

"(2) consider all applications for construction grants under this part and make to the Surgeon General such recommendations as it deems advisable with respect to (A) the approval of such applications, and (B) the amount which should be granted to each applicant whose application, in its opinion, should be approved.

"(c) The Surgeon General is authorized to use the services of any member or members of the Board, in connection with matters related to the administration of this part, for such periods, in addition to conference periods, as he may determine.

"(d) Appointed members of the Board who are not otherwise in the employ of the United States, while attending conferences of the Board or otherwise serving at the request of the Surgeon General in connection with the administration of this part, shall be entitled to receive compensation, per diem in lieu of subsistence, and travel expenses in the same manner and under the same conditions as that prescribed under section 373(d), when attending conferences, traveling, or serving at the request of the Surgeon General in connection with the administration of part H which deals with the National Library of Medicine.

"Assistance for construction of facilities

"SEC. 393. (a) In carrying out the purposes of section 390(b) (1), the Surgeon General may, upon application of any public or private nonprofit agency or institution, make grants to such agency or institution toward the cost of construction of any medical library facility to be constructed by such agency or institution.

"(b) A grant under this section may be made only if the application therefor is recommended for approval by the Board and is approved by the Surgeon General upon his determination that—

"(1) the application contains or is supported by reasonable assurances that (A) for not less than twenty years after completion of construction, the facility will be used as a medical library facility, (B) subject to subsection (c), sufficient funds will be available to meet the non-Federal share of the cost of constructing the facility, and (C) sufficient funds will be available, when construction is completed, for effective use of the facility for the purpose for which it is being constructed;

"(2) the proposed construction is necessary to meet the demonstrated needs for additional or improved medical library facilities in the community or area in which the proposed construction is to take place;

"(3) the application contains or is supported by adequate assurance that any laborer or mechanic employed by any contractor or subcontractor in the performance of work on the construction of the facility will be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon

Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a-5). The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in this paragraph, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

"(c) Within such aggregate monetary limit as the Surgeon General may prescribe, after consultation with the Board, applications which (solely by reason of the inability of the applicants to give the assurance required by clause (B) of subsection (b) (1)) fail to meet the requirements for approval set forth in subsection (b) may be approved upon condition that the applicants give the assurance required by such clause (B) within a reasonable time and upon such other reasonable terms and conditions as he may determine after consultation with the Board.

"(d) In acting upon applications for grants under this section, the Board and the Surgeon General shall take into consideration the relative effectiveness of the proposed facilities in meeting demonstrated needs for additional or improved medical library services, and shall give priority to applications for construction of facilities for which the need is greatest.

"(e) The amount of any grant made under this section shall be that recommended by the Board or such lesser amount as the Surgeon General determines to be appropriate; except that in no event may such amount exceed 75 per centum of the necessary cost of the construction of such facility as determined by him.

"(f) Upon approval of any application for a grant under this section, the Surgeon General shall reserve, from any appropriation available therefor, the amount of such grant as determined under subsection (e), and shall pay such amount, in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments consistent with construction progress, as he may determine. Such payments shall be made through the disbursement facilities of the Department of the Treasury. The Surgeon General's reservation of any amount under this subsection may be amended by him, either upon approval of an amendment of the application or upon revision of the estimated cost of construction of the facility.

"(g) In determining the amount of any grant under this section, there shall be excluded from the cost of construction an amount equal to the sum of (1) the amount of any other Federal grant which the applicant has obtained, or is assured of obtaining, with respect to the construction which is to be financed in part by grants authorized under this section, and (2) the amount of any non-Federal funds required to be expended as a condition of such other Federal grant.

"(h) If, within twenty years after completion of any construction for which funds have been paid under this section—

"(1) the applicant or other owner of the facility shall cease to be a public or nonprofit institution, or

"(2) the facility shall cease to be used for medical library purposes, unless the Surgeon General determines, in accordance with regulations prescribed by him after consultation with the Board, that there is good cause for releasing the applicant or other owner from the obligation to do so,

the United States shall be entitled to recover from the applicant or other owner of the facility the amount bearing the same ratio to the then value (as determined by agreement of the parties or by action brought in the United States district court for the district in which such facility is situated) of the facility, as the amount of the Federal participation bore to the cost of construction of such facility.

"(1) For the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this section, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and ending with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, such sums, not to exceed \$10,000,000 for any fiscal year, as may be necessary.

"Grants for training in medical library sciences"

"SEC. 394. (a) In order to enable the Surgeon General to carry out the purposes of section 390(b) (2), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and ending with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, such sums, not to exceed \$1,000,000 for any fiscal year, as may be necessary. Sums made available under this section shall be utilized by the Surgeon General in making grants—

"(1) to individuals to enable them to accept traineeships and fellowships leading to postbaccalaureate academic degrees in the field of medical library science, in related fields pertaining to sciences related to health, or in the field of the communication of information;

"(2) to individuals who are librarians or specialists in information on sciences relating to health, to enable them to undergo intensive training or retraining so as to attain greater competence in their occupations (including competence in the fields of automatic data processing and retrieval);

"(3) to assist appropriate public and private nonprofit institutions in developing, expanding, and improving, training programs in library science and the field of communication of information pertaining to sciences relating to health; and

"(4) to assist in the establishment of internship programs in established medical libraries meeting standards which the Surgeon General shall prescribe.

"(b) Payment pursuant to grants made under this section may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement and in such installments as the Surgeon General shall prescribe by regulations after consultation with the Board.

"Assistance to special scientific projects"

"SEC. 395. In order to enable the Surgeon General to carry out the purposes of section 390(b) (3), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and ending with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, such sums, not to exceed \$500,000 for any fiscal year, as may be necessary. Sums made available under this section shall be utilized by the Surgeon General for the establishment of special fellowships to be awarded to physicians and scientists for the compilation of existing, or writing of original, contributions relating to scientific, social, or cultural, advancements in sciences related to health. In establishing such fellowships, the Surgeon General shall make appropriate arrangements whereby the facilities of the National Library of Medicine and the facilities of libraries of public and private nonprofit institutions of higher learning may be made available in connection with the projects for which such fellowships are established.

"Research and development in medical library science and related fields"

"SEC. 396. (a) In order to enable the Surgeon General to carry out the purposes of section 390(b) (4), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and ending with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, such sums, not to exceed \$3,000,000 for any fiscal year, as may be necessary. Sums made available under this section shall be utilized by the Surgeon General in making grants to appropriate public

or private nonprofit institutions and entering into contracts with appropriate persons, for purposes of carrying out projects of research and investigations in the field of medical library science and related activities and for the development of new techniques, systems and equipment, for processing, storing, retrieving, and distributing information pertaining to sciences related to health.

"(b) Payment pursuant to grants made under this section may be in advance or by way of reimbursement and in such installments as the Surgeon General shall prescribe by regulations after consultation with the Board.

"Grants for improving and expanding the basic resources of medical libraries and related instrumentalities"

"SEC. 397. (a) In order to enable the Surgeon General to carry out the purposes of section 390(b) (5), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and ending with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, such sums, not to exceed \$3,000,000 for any fiscal year, as may be necessary.

"(b) Sums made available under this section shall be utilized by the Surgeon General for making grants of money, materials, or both, to public or private nonprofit medical libraries and related scientific communication instrumentalities for the purpose of expanding and improving their basic medical library or related resources. The uses for which grants so made may be employed include, but are not limited to, the following: (A) acquisition of books, journals, photographs, motion picture and other films, and other similar materials, (B) cataloging, binding, and other services and procedures for processing library resource materials for use by those who are served by the library or related instrumentality, and (C) acquisition of duplication devices, facsimile equipment, film projectors, recording equipment, and other equipment to facilitate the use of the resources of the library or related instrumentality by those who are served by it, and (D) introduction of new technologies in medical librarianship.

"(c) (1) The amount of any grant under this section to any medical library or related instrumentality shall be determined by the Surgeon General on the basis of the scope of library or related services provided by such library or instrumentality in relation to the population and purposes served by it. In making a determination of the scope of services served by any medical library or related instrumentality, the Surgeon General shall take into account the following factors—

"(A) the number of graduate and undergraduate students making use of the resources of such library or instrumentality;

"(B) the number of physicians utilizing the resources of such library or instrumentality;

"(C) the type of supportive staffs, if any, available to such library or instrumentality;

"(D) the type, size, and qualifications of the faculty of any school with which such library or instrumentality is affiliated;

"(E) the staff of any hospital or hospitals or of any clinic or clinics with which such library or instrumentality is affiliated; and

"(F) the geographic area served by such library or instrumentality and the availability, within such area, of medical library or related services provided by other libraries or related instrumentalities.

"(2) In no case shall any grant under this section to a medical library or related instrumentality during any fiscal year exceed \$200,000, or, if lesser, an amount equal to—

"(A) 60 per centum of the annual operating expenses of such library or related instrumentality, if such fiscal year is the first fiscal year with respect to which a grant under this section is made to it;

"(B) (1) 50 per centum of the annual operating expenses of such library or related instrumentality, (ii) or, if lesser, five-sixths of the amount of its first year grant under this section, if such year is the second fiscal year with respect to which a grant under this section has been made to it;

"(C) (1) 40 per centum of the annual operating expenses of such library or related instrumentality, (ii) or, if lesser, four-fifths of the amount of the second year grant under this section, if such year is the third fiscal year with respect to which a grant under this section has been made to it;

"(D) (1) 30 per centum of the annual operating expenses of such library or related instrumentality, (ii) or, if lesser, three-fourths of the amount of the third year grant under this section, if such year is the fourth fiscal year with respect to which a grant under this section has been made to it; and

"(E) (1) 20 per centum of the annual operating expenses of such library or related instrumentality, (ii) or, if lesser, two-thirds of the amount of the fourth year grant under this section, if such year is the fifth fiscal year with respect to which a grant under this section has been made to it. The 'annual operating expense' of a library or related instrumentality shall, for purposes of the preceding sentence, be an amount equal (if such annual operating expense is to be determined with respect to the first grant to be made to such library or instrumentality under this section) to the amount of the average of the annual operating expenses of such library or instrumentality over the three fiscal years preceding the year in which such grant is applied for; and if such library or related instrumentality has been operating for less than three years prior to applying for such grant, its 'annual operating expense' shall be an amount determined by the Surgeon General pursuant to regulations prescribed by him. For the second or succeeding fiscal year in which a grant is made to a library or related instrumentality, the 'annual operating expense' of such library or related instrumentality shall, for purposes of such sentence, be equal to its operating expense (exclusive of Federal financial assistance under this part) for the preceding fiscal year.

"Grants for establishment of regional medical libraries"

"SEC. 398. (a) In order to enable the Surgeon General to carry out the purposes of section 390(b) (6), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and ending with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, such sums, not to exceed \$2,500,000 for any fiscal year, as may be necessary. Sums made available under this section shall be utilized by the Surgeon General, with the advice of the Board, to make grants to existing public or private nonprofit medical libraries so as to enable each of them to serve as the regional medical library for the geographical area in which it is located.

"(b) The uses for which grants made under this section may be employed include, but are not limited to, the following—

"(1) acquisition of books, journals, and other similar materials;

"(2) cataloging, binding, and other procedures for processing library resource materials for use by those who are served by the library;

"(3) acquisition of duplicating devices and other equipment to facilitate the use of the resources of the library by those who are served by it;

"(4) acquisition of mechanisms and employment of personnel for the speedy transmission of materials from the regional library to local libraries in the geographic area served by the regional library; and

"(5) construction, renovation, rehabilitation, or expansion of physical plant considered necessary by such library to carry out its proper functions as a regional library.

"(c) (1) Grants under this section shall be made only to medical libraries which agree (A) to modify and increase their library resources so as to be able to provide supportive services to other libraries in the region as well as individual users of library services, (B) to provide free loan services to qualified users, and make available photoduplicated or facsimile copies of biomedical materials which qualified requesters may retain.

"(2) The Surgeon General, in awarding grants under this section, shall give priority to medical libraries having the greatest potential of fulfilling the needs for regional medical libraries. In determining the priority to be assigned to any medical library, he shall consider—

"(A) the need of such library, as determined by the levels of research, teaching, and medical activities of the library in relation to other existing library and medical communication services in the region;

"(B) the adequacy of the library (in terms of collections, personnel, equipment, and other facilities) as a basis for a regional medical library; and

"(C) the size and nature of the population to be served in the region in which the library is located.

"(d) Grants under this section for construction, renovation, rehabilitation, or expansion of physical plant shall be as are provided for grants made under section 393, except that the eligibility for any such grant would be determined on the basis of the construction requirements of the library so as to be able to serve as a regional medical library. Grants under this section for basic resource materials to a library may not exceed 50 per centum of the library's annual operating expense (exclusive of Federal financial assistance under this part) for the preceding year; or in case of the first year in which the library receives a grant under this section for basic resource materials, 50 per centum of its average annual operating expenses over the past three years (or if it had been in operation for less than three years, its annual operating expenses determined by the Surgeon General in accordance with regulations prescribed by him).

"(e) Payment pursuant to grants made under this section may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement and in such installment as the Surgeon General shall prescribe by regulations after consultation with the Board.

"Financial support of biomedical scientific publications"

"SEC. 399. (a) In order to enable the Surgeon General to carry out the purposes of section 390(b) (7), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and ending with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, such sums, not to exceed \$1,500,000 for any fiscal year, as may be necessary. Sums made available under this section shall be utilized by the Surgeon General, with the advice of the Board, in making grants to, and entering into appropriate contracts with, public or private nonprofit institutions of higher education and individual scientists for the purpose of supporting biomedical scientific publications of a nonprofit nature and to procure the compilation, writing, editing, and publication of reviews, abstracts, indices, handbooks, bibliographies, and related matter pertaining to scientific works and scientific developments.

"(b) Grants under this section in support of any single periodical publication may not be made for more than three years.

"(c) Payment pursuant to grants made under this section may be made in advance or

by way of reimbursement and in such installments as the Surgeon General shall prescribe by regulations after consultation with the Board.

"Continuing availability of appropriated funds"

"SEC. 399a. Funds appropriated to carry out any of the purposes of this part for any fiscal year shall remain available for such purposes for the fiscal year immediately following the fiscal year for which they were appropriated."

Mr. HARRIS (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of section 2 be dispensed with, that it be printed in the RECORD, and open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 3, line 2, after "physicians" insert the following: "and other practitioners in the sciences related to health".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 4, line 17, strike out "material". and insert in lieu thereof "material;" and immediately after such line 17 insert the following:

(4) the term "medical library" means a library related to the sciences related to health.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 6, line 18, strike out "ten" and insert in lieu thereof "twenty".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 7, beginning in line 8, strike out "the construction of the facility" and insert in lieu thereof "projects of the type covered by the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended,".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 9, line 14, strike out "ten" and insert in lieu thereof "twenty".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 10, line 11, strike out "1966" and insert in lieu thereof "1967".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 12, line 6, after "physicians" insert the following "and other practitioners in the sciences related to health".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 15, line 3, after "physicians" insert the following: "and other practitioners in the sciences related to health".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 21, line 2, strike out "\$1,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,000,000".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 22, beginning in line 1, strike out "appropriated." and insert in lieu thereof "appropriated.", and immediately after line 2, insert the following:

"RECORDS AND AUDIT"

"Sec. 399b. (a) Each recipient of a grant under this part shall keep such records as the Surgeon General shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such grant, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such grant is given or used, and the amount of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

"(b) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of such recipients that are pertinent to any grant received under the provisions of this part."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

REGIONAL BRANCHES OF THE NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

SEC. 3. Part H of title III of the Public Health Service Act which deals with the National Library of Medicine is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"REGIONAL BRANCHES OF THE NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE"

"Sec. 378. (a) Whenever the Surgeon General, with the advice of the Board, determines that—

"(1) in any geographic area of the United States, there is no regional medical library adequate to serve such area;

"(2) under the criteria prescribed in section 398, there is a need for a regional medical library to serve such area; and

"(3) because there is located in such area no medical library which, under the provisions of section 398, can feasibly be developed into a regional medical library adequate to serve such area,

he is authorized to establish, as a branch of the National Library of Medicine, a regional

medical library to serve the needs of such area.

"(b) For the purpose of establishing branches of the National Library of Medicine under this section, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and ending with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, such sums, not to exceed \$2,000,000 for any fiscal year, as may be necessary. Sums appropriated pursuant to this section for any fiscal year shall remain available until expended."

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

Sec. 4. Part H of title II of the Public Health Service Act which deals with the National Library of Medicine is amended by striking out, in section 373(d) thereof, "\$50" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$75".

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WELTNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3142) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a program of grants to assist in meeting the need for adequate medical library services and facilities, pursuant to House Resolution 590, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? [After a pause.] If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 296, nays 3, not voting 133, as follows:

[Roll No. 349]
YEAS—296

Abbitt	Beckworth	Burton, Calif.
Abernethy	Belcher	Byrne, Pa.
Adams	Bell	Byrnes, Wis.
Albert	Bennett	Cabell
Anderson,	Berry	Callan
Tenn.	Betts	Cameron
Andrews,	Bingham	Casey
N. Dak.	Blatnik	Cederberg
Annunzio	Boland	Chamberlain
Arends	Bow	Chelf
Ashbrook	Brademas	Clancy
Ashley	Brooks	Clausen,
Ashmore	Broomfield	Don H.
Ayres	Brown, Calif.	Clawson, Del.
Baldwin	Broyhill, Va.	Cleveland
Bandstra	Buchanan	Clevenger
Baring	Burke	Cohelan
Bates	Burleson	Collier

Conable	Hicks	Poage
Conte	Horton	Poff
Conyers	Howard	Pool
Corbett	Hull	Powell
Corman	Hungate	Price
Craley	Huot	Pucinski
Cramer	Hutchinson	Quie
Culver	Ichord	Randall
Cunningham	Irwin	Reid, Ill.
Curtin	Jacobs	Reid, N.Y.
Daddario	Jarman	Reifel
Dague	Jennings	Reinecke
Davis, Ga.	Joelson	Rhodes, Pa.
Davis, Wis.	Johnson, Pa.	Robison
de la Garza	Jones, Ala.	Rodino
Denton	Jones, Mo.	Rogers, Colo.
Derwinski	Karsten	Rogers, Fla.
Devine	Karth	Rogers, Tex.
Dickinson	Kastenmeier	Ronan
Dingell	King, Calif.	Rooney, N.Y.
Dole	King, N.Y.	Rosenthal
Dowdy	King, Utah	Roush
Downing	Krebs	Roybal
Dulski	Kunkel	Rumsfeld
Duncan, Tenn.	Landrum	Ryan
Dwyer	Langen	Satterfield
Edwards, Ala.	Leggett	St Germain
Edwards, Calif.	Lennon	Saylor
Ellsworth	Lipcomb	Scheuer
Erlenborn	Long, Md.	Schmidhauser
Evans, Colo.	Love	Schneebeli
Everett	McCarthy	Schweiker
Fallon	McClary	Secrest
Farbstein	McDade	Selden
Farnsley	McEwen	Senner
Farnum	McFall	Shriver
Fascell	McGrath	Sickles
Feighan	McMillan	Sisk
Fisher	McVicker	Skubitz
Flood	Machen	Smith, Calif.
Fogarty	Mackay	Smith, N.Y.
Foley	Mackie	Springer
Ford,	Mahon	Stafford
William D.	Mailliard	Staggers
Fountain	Marsh	Stalbaum
Fraser	Martin, Nebr.	Stanton
Friedel	Matsunaga	Stephens
Fulton, Pa.	Meeds	Stubblefield
Fulton, Tenn.	Miller	Sullivan
Fuqua	Mills	Talcott
Garmatz	Minish	Taylor
Gathings	Mink	Teague, Tex.
Gettys	Minshall	Thomson, Wis.
Gialmo	Moeller	Trimble
Gibbons	Monagan	Tuck
Gilbert	Moore	Tuten
Gonzalez	Moorhead	Udall
Gray	Morgan	Ullman
Green, Pa.	Morrison	Van Deerlin
Greigg	Morton	Vanik
Grider	Moss	Vigorito
Griffin	Multer	Vivian
Griffiths	Murphy, Ill.	Waggonner
Gross	Murray	Walker, N. Mex.
Grover	Natcher	Watkins
Gubser	Nedzi	Watson
Gurney	Nelsen	Weitner
Hagan, Ga.	O'Brien	Whalley
Hagen, Calif.	O'Hara, Mich.	White, Idaho
Haley	O'Konski	White, Tex.
Hall	Olsen, Mont.	Whitener
Halpern	Olson, Minn.	Whitten
Hamilton	O'Neal, Ga.	Wildnall
Hanna	O'Neill, Mass.	Wilson,
Hansen, Idaho	Ottinger	Charles H.
Hansen, Wash.	Passman	Wolf
Harris	Patman	Wright
Harvey, Ind.	Patten	Wylder
Harvey, Mich.	Pelly	Young
Hathaway	Pepper	Younger
Hechler	Perkins	Zablocki
Helstoski	Pickle	
Herlong	Pike	

NAYS—3

Findley Teague, Calif. Williams

NOT VOTING—133

Adair	Burton, Utah	Dow
Addabbo	Cahill	Duncan, Oreg.
Anderson, Ill.	Callaway	Dyal
Andrews,	Carey	Edmondson
George W.	Carter	Evins, Tenn.
Andrews,	Celler	Fino
Glenn	Clark	Flynt
Aspinall	Colmer	Ford, Gerald R.
Barrett	Cooley	Frelinghuysen
Boggs	Curtis	Gallagher
Boiling	Daniels	Gilligan
Bolton	Dawson	Goodell
Bonner	Delaney	Grabowski
Bray	Dent	Green, Oreg.
Brock	Diggs	Halleck
Broyhill, N.C.	Donohue	Hanley
	Dorn	Hansen, Iowa

Hardy Martin, Ala.
 Harsha Martin, Mass.
 Hawkins Matthias
 Hays Matthews
 Hébert May
 Henderson Michel
 Hollfield Mize
 Holland Morris
 Hosmer Morse
 Johnson, Calif. Mosher
 Johnson, Okla. Murphy, N.Y.
 Jonas Nix
 Kee O'Hara, Ill.
 Keith Philbin
 Kelly Pirnie
 Keogh Purcell
 Kirwan Quillen
 Kluczynski Race
 Kornegay Redlin
 Laird Resnick
 Latta Reuss
 Lindsay Rhodes, Ariz.
 Long, La. Rivers, S.C.
 McCulloch Rivers, Alaska
 McDowell Roberts
 Macdonald Roncallo
 MacGregor Rooney, Pa.
 Madden Rostenkowski

Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma with Mrs. Kelly.
 Mr. Johnson of California with Mr. Scott.
 Mr. Schisler with Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. Duncan of Oregon with Mr. Flynt.
 Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Steed.
 Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Shipley.
 Mr. Slack with Mr. Resnick.

Mr. PASSMAN and Mr. ABERNETHY changed their votes from "nay" to "yea." The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.
 A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 597) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a program of grants to assist in meeting the need for adequate health science library services and facilities, strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 3142, to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a program of grants to assist in meeting the need for adequate medical library services and facilities, as passed.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

S. 597

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Health Science Library Assistance Act of 1965".

SEC. 2. Title III of the Public Health Service Act is amended as follows:

(1) By striking out the part heading "PART H—NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE" and inserting in lieu thereof

"PART I—HEALTH SCIENCE LIBRARIES"

"Subpart 1—National Library of Medicine";

(2) By redesignating as section 381 through 387 the sections (relating to the National Library of Medicine) now numbered 371 through 377 and references thereto, and by striking out (wherever they occur in such sections) the words "this part" and inserting in lieu thereof "this subpart"; and

(3) By inserting at the end of such title III the following new subpart:

"Subpart 2—Assistance to Health Science Libraries"

"Declaration of Policy and Statement of Purpose"

"SEC. 390. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares that (1) the unprecedented expansion of knowledge in the health sciences within the past two decades has brought about a massive growth in the quantity, and major changes in the nature of, biomedical information, materials, and publications; (2) there has not been a corresponding growth in the facilities and techniques necessary to coordinate and disseminate adequately, among health scientists and practitioners, the ever-increasing volume of knowledge and information which has been developed in the health science field; (3) much of the value of the ever-increasing volume of knowledge and information which has been, and continues to be, developed in the health science field will be lost unless proper measures are taken in the immediate future to develop facilities and techniques necessary to collect, preserve,

store, process, retrieve, and facilitate the dissemination and utilization of, such knowledge and information.

"(b) It is therefore the policy of this subpart to—

"(1) assist in the construction of new, and the expansion, remodeling, alteration, or renovation of existing health science library facilities;

"(2) assist in the training of health science librarians and other information specialists in the health sciences;

"(3) assist, through the awarding of fellowships to physicians, other health science practitioners, and scientists, in the compilation of existing, and the creation of additional, written matter which will facilitate the distribution and utilization of knowledge and information relating to advancements in sciences related to health;

"(4) assist in the conduct of research and investigations in health library science and related activities, and in the development of new techniques, systems, and equipment for processing, storing, retrieving, and distributing information in the sciences related to health;

"(5) assist in improving and expanding the basic resources of health science libraries and related facilities;

"(6) assist in the development of a national system of regional health science libraries each of which would have facilities of sufficient depth and scope to supplement the services of other health science libraries within the region served by it; and

"(7) provide financial support to biomedical scientific publications.

"Definitions"

"SEC. 391. As used in this subpart—

"(1) the term 'sciences related to health' includes medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, and public health, and fundamental and applied sciences when related thereto;

"(2) the terms 'health science library' and 'library' mean a library in one or more of the fields of the sciences related to health;

"(3) the term 'health library science' means library science in one or more of the fields of the sciences related to health, and the term 'health science librarian' means a person trained in health library science;

"(4) the terms 'construction' and 'cost of construction', when used with reference to any health science library facility, include (A) the construction of new buildings, and the expansion, remodeling, alteration, and renovation of existing buildings, including architects' fees, but not including the cost of acquisition of land or off-site improvements, and (B) equipping new buildings and existing buildings (whether or not expanded, remodeled, altered, or renovated) for use as a library (including provision of automatic data processing equipment) but not with books, pamphlets, or related material.

"National Health Science Libraries Assistance Advisory Board"

"SEC. 392. (a) The Board of Regents of the National Library of Medicine established pursuant to section 383(a) shall, in addition to its functions prescribed under section 383, constitute and serve as the National Health Science Libraries Assistance Advisory Board (hereinafter in this subpart referred to as the 'Board').

"(b) The Board shall—

"(1) advise and assist the Surgeon General in the preparation of general regulations and with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this subpart; and

"(2) consider all applications for construction grants under this subpart and make to the Surgeon General such recommendations as it deems advisable with respect to (A) the approval of such applications, and (B) the amount which should be granted to each applicant whose application, in its opinion, should be approved.

So the bill was passed.
 The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Battin.
 Mr. Keogh with Mr. Laird.
 Mr. Tunney with Mr. Carter.
 Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Halleck.
 Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Bray.
 Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Tupper.
 Mr. Hollfield with Mr. Hosmer.
 Mr. Celler with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.
 Mr. Matthews with Mr. Jonas.
 Mr. Sikes with Mr. Broyhill of North Carolina.
 Mr. Hansen of Iowa with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.
 Mr. Henderson with Mrs. Bolton.
 Mr. Cooley with Mr. Adair.
 Mr. Kee with Mr. Cahill.
 Mr. Thomas with Mrs. May.
 Mr. Dawson with Mr. Morse.
 Mr. Hays with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
 Mr. Watts with Mr. McCulloch.
 Mr. Hébert with Mr. Bob Wilson.
 Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Pirnie.
 Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
 Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Brock.
 Mr. Carey with Mr. Utt.
 Mr. Dyal with Mr. Roudebush.
 Mr. Delaney with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
 Mr. Dow with Mr. Quillen.
 Mr. Daniels with Mr. Latta.
 Mr. Morris with Mr. Michel.
 Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Mathias.
 Mr. Dent with Mr. Flno.
 Mr. Race with Mr. Burton of Utah.
 Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Walker of Mississippi.
 Mr. Redlin with Mr. Glenn Andrews.
 Mr. Toll with Mr. MacGregor.
 Mr. Sweeney with Mr. Harsha.
 Mr. Stratton with Mr. Mosher.
 Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Wyatt.
 Mr. Kornegay with Mr. Callaway.
 Mr. Roncallo with Mr. Mize.
 Mr. Purcell with Mr. Martin of Alabama.
 Mr. Barrett with Mr. Keith.
 Mr. Donohue with Mr. Curtis.
 Mr. Philbin with Mr. Goodell.
 Mr. Willis with Mr. Lindsay.
 Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. McDowell.
 Mr. Madden with Mr. Macdonald.
 Mr. Digs with Mr. Gallagher.
 Mr. Grabowski with Mr. Nix.
 Mr. Gilligan with Mrs. Green of Oregon.
 Mr. Hanley with Mr. O'Hara of Illinois.
 Mr. Hardy with Mr. Yates.
 Mr. Todd with Mr. Dorn.
 Mr. Evins with Mr. Clark.
 Mr. Colmer with Mr. Aspinall.
 Mr. Boggs with Mr. George W. Andrews.
 Mr. Bonner with Mr. Holland.

"(c) The Surgeon General is authorized to use the services of any member or members of the Board, in connection with matters related to the administration of this subpart, for such periods, in addition to conference periods, as he may determine.

"(d) Section 383(d) shall apply to appointed members of the Board who are not otherwise in the employ of the United States, while attending conferences of the Board, traveling, or otherwise serving at the request of the Surgeon General in connection with the administration of this subpart.

"Assistance for Construction of Facilities

"SEC. 393. (a) In carrying out the purposes of section 390(b)(1), the Surgeon General may, upon application of any public or private nonprofit agency or institution, make grants to such agency or institution toward the cost of construction of any health science library facility to be constructed by such agency or institution.

"(b) A grant under this section may be made only if the application therefor is recommended for approval by the Board and is approved by the Surgeon General upon his determination that—

"(1) the application contains or is supported by reasonable assurances that (A) for not less than ten years after completion of construction, the facility will be used as a health science library facility, (B) subject to subsection (c), sufficient funds will be available to meet the non-Federal share of the cost of constructing the facility, and (C) sufficient funds will be available, when construction is completed, for effective use of the facility for the purpose for which it is being constructed;

"(2) the proposed construction is necessary to meet the demonstrated needs for additional or improved health science library facilities in the community or area in which the proposed construction is to take place;

"(3) the application contains or is supported by adequate assurance that any laborer or mechanic employed by any contractor or subcontractor in the performance of work on the construction of the facility will be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a-5). The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in this paragraph, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

"(c) Within such aggregate monetary limit as the Surgeon General may prescribe after consultation with the Board, applications which (solely by reason of the inability of the applicants to give the assurance required by clause (B) of subsection (b)(1)) fail to meet the requirements for approval set forth in subsection (b) may be approved upon condition that the applicants give the assurance required by such clause (B) within a reasonable time and upon such other reasonable terms and conditions as he may determine after consultation with the Board.

"(d) In acting upon applications for grants under this section, the Board and the Surgeon General shall take into consideration the relative effectiveness of the proposed facilities in meeting demonstrated needs for additional or improved health science library services, and shall give priority to applications for construction of facilities for which the need is greatest.

"(e) The amount of any grant made under this section shall be that recommended by the Board or such lesser amount as the Surgeon General determines to be appropriate; except that in no event may

such amount exceed 75 per centum of the necessary cost of the construction of such facility as determined by him.

"(f) Upon approval of any application for a grant under this section, the Surgeon General shall reserve, from any appropriation available therefor, the amount of such grant as determined under subsection (e), and shall pay such amount, in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments consistent with construction progress, as he may determine. Such payments shall be made through the disbursement facilities of the Department of the Treasury. The Surgeon General's reservation of any amount under this subsection may be amended by him, either upon approval of an amendment of the application or upon revision of the estimated cost of construction of the facility.

"(g) In determining the amount of any grant under this section, there shall be excluded from the cost of construction an amount equal to the sum of (1) the amount of any other Federal grant which the applicant has obtained, or is assured of obtaining, with respect to the construction which is to be financed in part by grants authorized under this section, and (2) the amount of any non-Federal funds required to be expended as a condition of such other Federal grant.

"(h) If, within ten years after completion of any construction for which funds have been paid under this section—

"(1) the applicant or other owner of the facility shall cease to be a public or nonprofit agency or institution, or

"(2) the facility shall cease to be used for health science library purposes, unless the Surgeon General determines, in accordance with regulations prescribed by him after consultation with the Board, that there is good cause for releasing the applicant or other owner from the obligation to do so, the United States shall be entitled to recover from the applicant or other owner of the facility the amount bearing the same ratio to the then value (as determined by agreement of the parties or by action brought in the United States District Court for the district in which such facility is situated) of the facility, as the amount of the Federal participation bore to the cost of construction of such facility.

"(i) For the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this section, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated over a period of four fiscal years, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, such sums, not to exceed \$50,000,000 in the aggregate, as may be necessary.

"Grants for Training in Library Sciences

"SEC. 394. In order to carry out the purposes of section 390(b)(2), the Surgeon General may make grants—

"(1) to individuals to enable them to pursue programs of study leading to post-baccalaureate academic degree in health library science, in related fields pertaining to sciences related to health, or in the field of the communication of information;

"(2) to individuals who are librarians or specialists in information on sciences related to health, to enable them to undergo intensive training or retraining so as to attain greater competence in their occupations including competence in the fields of automatic data processing and retrieval;

"(3) to assist appropriate public and private nonprofit institutions in developing, expanding, and improving training programs in health library science and in the field of communication of information pertaining to sciences related to health; and

"(4) to assist in the establishment of internship programs in health science libraries meeting standards which the Surgeon General shall prescribe.

"Assistance to Special Scientific Projects

"SEC. 395. In order to carry out the purposes of section 390(b)(3), the Surgeon General may establish and maintain fellowships (with such stipends and allowances, including traveling and subsistence expense, as he may deem necessary) to be awarded to physicians, other practitioners in sciences related to health, and scientists for the compilation of existing, or writing of original, contributions (including historical studies) relating to advancements in sciences related to health. In establishing such fellowships, the Surgeon General shall make appropriate arrangements whereby the facilities of the National Library of Medicine and the facilities of libraries of public and private nonprofit institutions of higher learning may be made available in connection with the projects for which such fellowships are established.

"Research and Development in Library Science and Related Fields

"SEC. 396. In order to carry out the purposes of section 390(b)(4), the Surgeon General may make grants to appropriate public or private nonprofit institutions, and may enter into contracts with appropriate persons, for projects of research and investigations in health library science and related activities and for the development of new techniques, systems, and equipment for processing, storing, retrieving, and distributing information pertaining to sciences related to health.

"Grants for Improving and Expanding the Basic Resources of Health Science Libraries and Related Instrumentalities

"SEC. 397. (a) In order to carry out the purposes of section 390(b)(5), the Surgeon General may make grants of money, materials, or both, to public or private nonprofit health science libraries and functionally related scientific communication instrumentalities for the purpose of expanding and improving their basic health science library or related resources. The uses for which grants so made may be employed include, but are not limited to, the following: (1) acquisition of books, journals, photographs, motion pictures and other films, and other similar materials, (2) cataloging, binding, and other services and procedures for processing library resource materials for use by those who are served by the library or related instrumentality, (3) acquisition of duplicating devices, facsimile equipment, film projectors, recording equipment, and other equipment to facilitate the use of the resources of the library or related instrumentality by those who are served by it, and (4) introduction of new technologies in health science librarianship.

"(b)(1) The amount of any grant under this section to any health science library or related instrumentality shall be determined by the Surgeon General on the basis of the scope of library or related services provided by such library or instrumentality in relation to the population and purposes served by it. In making a determination of the scope of services served by any health science library or related instrumentality, the Surgeon General shall take into account the following factors—

"(A) the number of graduate and undergraduate students making use of the resources of such library or instrumentality;

"(B) the number of physicians and other health science practitioners utilizing the resources of such library or instrumentality;

"(C) the type of supportive staffs, if any, available to such library or instrumentality;

"(D) the type, size, and qualifications, of the faculty of any school with which such library or instrumentality is affiliated;

"(E) the staff of any hospital or hospitals or of any clinic or clinics with which such library or instrumentality is affiliated;

"(F) the geographic area served by such library or instrumentality and the availability, within such area, of health science library or related services provided by other libraries or related instrumentalities; and

"(G) such other factors as he may determine to be relevant.

"(2) In no case shall any grant under this section to a health science library or related instrumentality with respect to any fiscal year exceed \$200,000, or if less, an amount equal to—

"(A) 60 per centum of the annual operating expenses of such library or related instrumentality, if such fiscal year is the first fiscal year with respect to which a grant under this section is made to it;

"(B) (i) 50 per centum of the annual operating expenses of such library or related instrumentality, or (ii) if less, five-sixths of the amount of its first year grant under this section, if such year is the second fiscal year with respect to which a grant under this section has been made to it;

"(C) (i) 40 per centum of the annual operating expenses of such library or related instrumentality, or (ii) if less, four-fifths of the amount of the second year grant under this section, if such year is the third fiscal year with respect to which a grant under this section has been made to it;

"(D) (i) 30 per centum of the annual operating expenses of such library or related instrumentality, or (ii) if less, three-fourths of the amount of the third year grant under this section, if such year is the fourth fiscal year with respect to which a grant under this section has been made to it;

"(E) (i) 20 per centum of the annual operating expenses of such library or related instrumentality, or (ii) if less, two-thirds of the amount of the fourth year grant under this section, if such year is the fifth fiscal year with respect to which a grant under this section has been made to it.

The 'annual operating expense' of a library or related instrumentality shall, for purposes of the preceding sentence, be an amount equal (if such annual operating expense is to be determined with respect to the first grant to be made to such library or instrumentality under this section) to the amount of the average of the annual operating expenses of such library or instrumentality over the three fiscal years preceding the year in which such grant is applied for; and if such library or related instrumentality has been operating for less than three years prior to applying for such grant, its 'annual operating expense' shall be an amount determined by the Surgeon General pursuant to regulations prescribed by him. For the second or succeeding fiscal year in which a grant is made to a library or related instrumentality, the 'annual operating expense' of such library or related instrumentality shall, for purposes of such sentence, be equal to its operating expense (exclusive of Federal financial assistance under this part) for the preceding fiscal year.

"(c) No grant shall be made under this section unless the application therefor contains or is supported by satisfactory assurance that the amount of such grant will be so used as to supplement the level of funds that would, in the absence of such grant, be made available by the applicant for the purposes of this section, and will in no case supplant such funds.

"Financial Support of Biomedical Scientific Publications

"Sec. 398. (a) In order to carry out the purposes of section 390(b)(7), the Surgeon General may, with the advice of the Board, make grants to, and enter into appropriate contracts with, public or private nonprofit institutions of higher education, nonprofit professional scientific organizations, and individual scientists for the purpose of supporting biomedical scientific publications and to procure the compilation, writing, editing,

and publication of reviews, abstracts, indices, handbooks, bibliographies, and related matter pertaining to scientific works and scientific developments.

"(b) Grants under this section in support of any single periodical publication may not be made for more than three years.

"Limitation on Appropriations for Sections 394, 395, 396, 397, and 398

"Sec. 399. For the purpose of carrying out sections 394, 395, 396, 397, and 398, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$4,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, \$7,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, \$12,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and \$12,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970.

"Grants for Establishment of Regional Health Science Libraries

"Sec. 399A. (a) In order to carry out the purposes of section 390(b)(6), the Surgeon General may, with the advice of the Board, make grants to established public or private nonprofit health science libraries so as to enable each of them to serve as the regional health science library for the geographical area in which it is located.

"(b) The uses for which grants under this section may be made include, but are not limited to—

"(1) acquisition of books, journals, photographs, motion picture and other films, and other similar materials;

"(2) cataloging, binding, and other services and procedures for processing library resource materials for use by those who are served by the library;

"(3) acquisition of duplicating devices, facsimile equipment, film projectors, recording equipment, and other equipment to facilitate the use of the resources of the library by those who are served by it;

"(4) introduction of new technologies in health science librarianship;

"(5) acquisition of mechanisms and employment of personnel for the speedy transmission of materials from the regional library to local libraries in the geographic area served by the regional library; and

"(6) effective with respect to fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1966, construction necessary in order that such library may carry out its proper functions as a regional library.

"(c) (1) Grants under this section shall be made only to health science libraries which agree (A) to modify and increase their library resources so as to be able to provide supportive services to other libraries in the region as well as individual users of library services, and (B) to provide free loan services to qualified users, and make available photo-duplicated or facsimile copies of biomedical materials which qualified requesters may retain.

"(2) The Surgeon General, in awarding grants under this section, shall give priority to health science libraries having the greatest potential for functioning as regional health science libraries. In determining the priority to be assigned to any health science library, he shall consider—

"(A) the need for such library, as determined by the levels of research, teaching, and other activities in sciences related to health in support of which such library is utilized, in relation to other existing health science library and related communication services in the region;

"(B) the adequacy of the library (in terms of collections, personnel, equipment, and other facilities) as a basis for a regional health science library; and

"(C) the size and nature of the population to be served in the region in which the library is located.

"(d) (1) Grants under this section for construction shall be made in the same manner

and subject to the same conditions as are provided for grants made under section 393, except that the eligibility for any such grant shall, in lieu of the criterion set forth in section 393(b)(2), be determined on the basis of the need for such construction in order to enable the library to serve as a regional health science library. Grants under this section for purposes set forth in subsection (b) (1) through (5) of this section may not exceed (A) 50 per centum of the library's annual operating expense (exclusive of Federal financial assistance under this subpart) for the preceding year; or (B) in case of the first year in which the library receives a grant under this section for such purposes, 50 per centum of its average annual operating expenses over the past three years (or if it had been in operation for less than three years, its annual operating expenses determined by the Surgeon General in accordance with regulations prescribed by him).

"(2) No grant shall be made under this section for purposes set forth in subsection (b) (1) through (5) unless the application for such grant contains or is supported by satisfactory assurance that such grant will be so used as to supplement the level of funds that would, in the absence of such grant, be made available by the applicant for such purposes, and will in no case supplant such funds.

"(e) Whenever the Surgeon General, with the advice of the Board, determines that—

"(1) in any geographic area of the United States, there is no regional health science library adequate to serve such area;

"(2) under the criteria prescribed in the preceding subsections of this section there is a need for a regional health science library to serve such area; and

"(3) there is located in such area no health science library which, under the provisions of the preceding subsections of this section, can feasibly be developed into a regional health science library adequate to serve such area,

he is authorized to establish and maintain, as a branch of the National Library of Medicine, a regional health science library to serve the needs of such area. The provisions of sections 381 through 386 of subpart 1 shall, so far as applicable, apply for the purposes of this subsection, subject to subsection (f).

"(f) For the purpose of carrying out this section, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$1,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, \$3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, \$5,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, \$6,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and \$6,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970."

"Continuing Availability of Appropriated Funds

"Sec. 399B. Funds appropriated to carry out any of the purposes of this subpart for any fiscal year shall remain available for obligation for such purposes for the fiscal year immediately following the fiscal year for which they were appropriated. Payments pursuant to any section of this subpart may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement and in such installments as the Surgeon General shall prescribe after consultation with the Board."

Compensation of Members of the Board of Regents of the National Library of Medicine

Sec. 3. Subsection (d) of the section of the Public Health Service Act which is redesignated as section 383 by section 2 of this Act is amended by striking out "\$50" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$75".

Other Authority Not Affected

Sec. 4. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as limiting the authorities and responsibilities, under any other provision of the Public Health Service Act or any other

law, of the Surgeon General, the Public Health Service, or the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HARRIS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The CLERK. The amendment offered by Mr. HARRIS is to strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 597 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Medical Library Assistance Act of 1965".

SEC. 2. Title III of the Public Health Service Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new part:

"PART I—ASSISTANCE TO MEDICAL LIBRARIES
"Declaration of policy and statement of purpose

"SEC. 390. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares that (1) the unprecedented expansion of knowledge in the health sciences within the past two decades has brought about a massive growth in the quantity, and major changes in the nature of, biomedical information, materials, and publications; (2) there has not been a corresponding growth in the facilities and techniques necessary adequately to coordinate and disseminate among health scientists and practitioners the ever increasing volume of knowledge and information which has been developed in the health science field; (3) much of the value of the ever increasing volume of knowledge and information which has been, and continues to be, developed in the health science field will be lost unless proper measures are taken in the immediate future to develop facilities and techniques necessary to collect, preserve, store, process, retrieve, and facilitate the dissemination and utilization of, such knowledge and information.

"(b) It is therefore the policy of this part to—

"(1) assist in the construction of new, and the renovation, expansion, or rehabilitation, of existing medical library facilities;

"(2) assist in the training of medical librarians and other information specialists in the health sciences;

"(3) assist through the awarding of special fellowships to physicians and other practitioners in the sciences related to health and scientists, in the compilation of existing, and the creation of additional, written matter which will facilitate the distribution and utilization of knowledge and information relating to scientific, social and cultural advancements in sciences related to health;

"(4) assist in the conduct of research and investigations in the field of medical library science and related activities, and in the development of new techniques, systems and equipment for processing, storing, retrieving, and distributing information in the sciences related to health;

"(5) assist in improving and expanding the basic resources of medical libraries and related facilities;

"(6) assist in the development of a national system of regional medical libraries each of which would have facilities of sufficient depth and scope to supplement the services of other medical libraries within the region served by it; and

"(7) provide financial support to biomedical scientific publications.

"Definitions

"SEC. 391. As used in this part—

"(1) the term 'sciences related to health' includes medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, and public health, and fundamental and applied sciences when related thereto;

"(2) the terms 'National Medical Libraries Assistance Advisory Board' and 'Board' mean the Board of Regents of the National

Library of Medicine established under section 373(a) of this Act;

"(3) the terms 'construction' and 'cost of construction', when used with reference to any medical library facility, include (A) the construction of new buildings, and the expansion, remodeling, and alteration of existing buildings, including architects' fees, but not including the cost of acquisition of land or off-site improvements, and (B) equipping new buildings and existing buildings (whether or not expanded, remodeled, or altered) for use as a library (including provision of automatic data processing equipment), but not with books, pamphlets, or related material;

"(4) the term 'medical library' means a library related to the sciences related to health.

"NATIONAL MEDICAL LIBRARIES ASSISTANCE BOARD

"SEC. 392. (a) The Board of Regents of the National Library of Medicine established pursuant to section 373(a) shall, in addition to its functions prescribed under section 373, constitute and serve as the National Medical Libraries Assistance Advisory Board (hereinafter in this part referred to as the 'Board').

"(b) The Board shall—

"(1) advise and assist the Surgeon General in the preparation of general regulations and with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this part, and

"(2) consider all applications for construction grants under this part and make to the Surgeon General such recommendations as it deems advisable with respect to (A) the approval of such applications, and (B) the amount which should be granted to each applicant whose application, in its opinion, should be approved.

"(c) The Surgeon General is authorized to use the services of any member or members of the Board, in connection with matters related to the administration of this part, for such periods, in addition to conference periods, as he may determine.

"(d) Appointed members of the Board who are not otherwise in the employ of the United States, while attending conferences of the Board or otherwise serving at the request of the Surgeon General in connection with the administration of this part, shall be entitled to receive compensation, per diem in lieu of subsistence, and travel expenses in the same manner and under the same conditions as that prescribed under section 373(d), when attending conferences, traveling, or serving at the request of the Surgeon General in connection with the administration of part H which deals with the National Library of Medicine.

"Assistance for construction of facilities

"SEC. 393. (a) In carrying out the purposes of section 390(b) (1), the Surgeon General may, upon application of any public or private nonprofit agency or institution, make grants to such agency or institution toward the cost of construction of any medical library facility to be constructed by such agency or institution.

"(b) A grant under this section may be made only if the application therefor is recommended for approval by the Board and is approved by the Surgeon General upon his determination that—

"(1) the application contains or is supported by reasonable assurances that (A) for not less than twenty years after completion of construction, the facility will be used as a medical library facility, (B) subject to subsection (c), sufficient funds will be available to meet the non-Federal share of the cost of constructing the facility, and (C) sufficient funds will be available, when construction is completed, for effective use of the facility for the purpose for which it is being constructed;

"(2) the proposed construction is necessary to meet the demonstrated needs for additional or improved medical library facilities in the community or area in which the proposed construction is to take place;

"(3) the application contains or is supported by adequate assurance that any laborer or mechanic employed by any contractor or subcontractor in the performance of work on projects of the type covered by the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended, will be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a-276a5). The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in this paragraph, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

"(c) Within such aggregate monetary limit as the Surgeon General may prescribe, after consultation with the Board, applications which (solely by reason of the inability of the applicants to give the assurance required by clause (B) of subsection (b) (1) fail to meet the requirements for approval set forth in subsection (b) may be approved upon condition that the applicants give the assurance required by such clause (B) within a reasonable time and upon such other reasonable terms and conditions as he may determine after consultation with the Board.

"(d) In acting upon applications for grants under this section, the Board and the Surgeon General shall take into consideration the relative effectiveness of the proposed facilities in meeting demonstrated needs for additional or improved medical library services, and shall give priority to applications for construction of facilities for which the need is greatest.

"(e) The amount of any grant made under this section shall be that recommended by the Board or such lesser amount as the Surgeon General determines to be appropriate; except that in no event may such amount exceed 75 per centum of the necessary cost of the construction of such facility as determined by him.

"(f) Upon approval of any application for a grant under this section, the Surgeon General shall reserve, from any appropriation available therefor, the amount of such grant as determined under subsection (e), and shall pay such amount, in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments consistent with construction progress, as he may determine. Such payments shall be made through the disbursement facilities of the Department of the Treasury. The Surgeon General's reservation of any amount under this subsection may be amended by him, either upon approval of an amendment of the application or upon revision of the estimated cost of construction of the facility.

"(g) In determining the amount of any grant under this section, there shall be excluded from the cost of construction an amount equal to the sum of (1) the amount of any other Federal grant which the applicant has obtained, or is assured of obtaining, with respect to the construction which is to be financed in part by grants authorized under this section, and (2) the amount of any non-Federal funds required to be expended as a condition of such other Federal grant.

"(h) If, within twenty years after completion of any construction for which funds have been paid under this section—

"(1) the applicant or other owner of the facility shall cease to be a public or nonprofit institution, or

"(2) the facility shall cease to be used for medical library purposes, unless the Surgeon General determines, in accordance with regulations prescribed by him after consulta-

tion with the Board, that there is good cause for releasing the applicant or other owner from the obligation to do so,

the United States shall be entitled to recover from the applicant or other owner of the facility the amount bearing the same ratio to the then value (as determined by agreement of the parties or by action brought in the United States district court for the district in which such facility is situated) of the facility, as the amount of the Federal participation bore to the cost of construction of such facility.

"(i) For the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this section, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and ending with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, such sums, not to exceed \$10,000,000 for any fiscal year, as may be necessary.

"Grants for training in medical library sciences"

"Sec. 394. (a) In order to enable the Surgeon General to carry out the purposes of section 390(b)(2), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and ending with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, such sums, not to exceed \$1,000,000 for any fiscal year, as may be necessary. Sums made available under this section shall be utilized by the Surgeon General in making grants—

"(1) to individuals to enable them to accept traineeships and fellowships leading to postbaccalaureate academic degrees in the field of medical library science, in related fields pertaining to sciences related to health, or in the field of the communication of information;

"(2) to individuals who are librarians or specialists in information on sciences relating to health, to enable them to undergo intensive training or retraining so as to attain greater competence in their occupations (including competence in the fields of automatic data processing and retrieval);

"(3) to assist appropriate public and private nonprofit institutions in developing, expanding, and improving training programs in library science and the field of communications of information pertaining to sciences relating to health; and

"(4) to assist in the establishment of internship programs in established medical libraries meeting standards which the Surgeon General shall prescribe.

"(b) Payment pursuant to grants made under this section may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement and in such installments as the Surgeon General shall prescribe by regulation after consultation with the Board.

"Assistance to special scientific projects"

"Sec. 395. In order to enable the Surgeon General to carry out the purposes of section 390(b)(3), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and ending with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, such sums, not to exceed \$500,000 for any fiscal year, as may be necessary. Sums made available under this section shall be utilized by the Surgeon General for the establishment of special fellowships to be awarded to physicians and other practitioners in the sciences related to health and scientists for the compilation of existing, or writing of original, contributions relating to scientific, social, or cultural, advancements in sciences related to health. In establishing such fellowships, the Surgeon General shall make appropriate arrangements whereby the facilities of the National Library of Medicine and the facilities of libraries of public and private nonprofit institutions of higher learning may be made available in connection with the

projects for which such fellowships are established.

"Research and development in medical library science and related fields"

"Sec. 396. (a) In order to enable the Surgeon General to carry out the purposes of section 390(b)(4), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and ending with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, such sums, not to exceed \$3,000,000 for any fiscal year, as may be necessary. Sums made available under this section shall be utilized by the Surgeon General in making grants to appropriate public or private nonprofit institutions and entering into contracts with appropriate persons, for purposes of carrying out projects of research and investigations in the field of medical library science and related activities and for the development of new techniques, systems and equipment, for processing, storing, retrieving, and distributing information pertaining to sciences related to health.

"(b) Payment pursuant to grants made under this section may be in advance or by way of reimbursement and in such installments as the Surgeon General shall prescribe by regulations after consultation with the Board.

"Grants for improving and expanding the basic resources of medical libraries and related instrumentalities"

"Sec. 397. (a) In order to enable the Surgeon General to carry out the purposes of section 390(b)(5), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and ending with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, such sums, not to exceed \$3,000,000 for any fiscal year, as may be necessary.

"(b) Sums made available under this section shall be utilized by the Surgeon General for making grants of money, materials, or both, to public or private nonprofit medical libraries and related scientific communication instrumentalities for the purpose of expanding and improving their basic medical library or related resources. The uses for which grants so made may be employed include, but are not limited to, the following: (A) acquisition of books, journals, photographs, motion picture and other films, and other similar materials, (B) cataloging, binding, and other services and procedures for processing library resource materials for use by those who are served by the library or related instrumentality, and (C) acquisition of duplication devices, facsimile equipment, film projectors, recording equipment, and other equipment to facilitate the use of the resources of the library or related instrumentality by those who are served by it, and (D) introduction of new technologies in medical librarianship.

"(c) (1) The amount of any grant under this section to any medical library or related instrumentality shall be determined by the Surgeon General on the basis of the scope of library or related services provided by such library or instrumentality in relation to the population and purposes served by it. In making a determination of the scope of services served by any medical library or related instrumentality, the Surgeon General shall take into account the following factors—

"(A) the number of graduate and undergraduate students making use of the resources of such library or instrumentality;

"(B) the number of physicians and other practitioners in the sciences related to health utilizing the resources of such library or instrumentality;

"(C) the type of supportive staffs, if any, available to such library or instrumentality;

"(D) the type, size, and qualifications of the faculty of any school with which such library or instrumentality is affiliated;

"(E) the staff of any hospital or hospitals or of any clinic or clinics with which such library or instrumentality is affiliated; and

"(F) the geographic area served by such library or instrumentality and the availability, within such area, of medical library or related services provided by other libraries or related instrumentalities.

"(2) In no case shall any grant under this section to a medical library or related instrumentality during any fiscal year exceed \$200,000, or, if lesser, an amount equal to—

"(A) 60 per centum of the annual operating expenses of such library or related instrumentality, if such fiscal year is the first fiscal year with respect to which a grant under this section is made to it;

"(B) (i) 50 per centum of the annual operating expenses of such library or related instrumentality, (ii) or, if lesser, five-sixths of the amount of its first year grant under this section, if such year is the second fiscal year with respect to which a grant under this section has been made to it;

"(C) (i) 40 per centum of the annual operating expenses of such library or related instrumentality, (ii) or, if lesser, four-fifths of the amount of the second year grant under this section, if such year is the third fiscal year with respect to which a grant under this section has been made to it;

"(D) (i) 30 per centum of the annual operating expenses of such library or related instrumentality, (ii) or, if lesser, three-fourths of the amount of the third year grant under this section, if such year is the fourth fiscal year with respect to which a grant under this section has been made to it; and

"(E) (i) 20 per centum of the annual operating expenses of such library or related instrumentality, (ii) or, if lesser, two-thirds of the amount of the fourth year grant under this section, if such year is the fifth fiscal year with respect to which a grant under this section has been made to it.

The 'annual operating expense' of a library or related instrumentality shall, for purposes of the preceding sentence, be an amount equal (if such annual operating expense is to be determined with respect to the first grant to be made to such library or instrumentality under this section) to the amount of the average of the annual operating expenses of such library or instrumentality over the three fiscal years preceding the year in which such grant is applied for; and if such library or related instrumentality has been operating for less than three years prior to applying for such grant, its 'annual operating expense' shall be an amount determined by the Surgeon General pursuant to regulations prescribed by him. For the second or succeeding fiscal year in which a grant is made to a library or related instrumentality, the 'annual operating expense' of such library or related instrumentality shall, for purposes of such sentence, be equal to its operating expense (exclusive of Federal financial assistance under this part) for the preceding fiscal year.

"Grants for establishment of regional medical libraries"

"Sec. 398. (a) In order to enable the Surgeon General to carry out the purposes of section 390(b)(6), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and ending with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, such sums, not to exceed \$2,500,000 for any fiscal year, as may be necessary. Sums made available under this section shall be utilized by the Surgeon General, with the advice of the Board, to make grants to existing public or private nonprofit medical libraries so as to enable each of them to serve as the regional medical library for the geographical area in which it is located.

"(b) The uses for which grants made under this section may be employed include, but are not limited to, the following—

"(1) acquisition of books, journals, and other similar materials;

"(2) cataloging, binding, and other procedures for processing library resource materials for use by those who are served by the library;

"(3) acquisition of duplicating devices and other equipment to facilitate the use of the resources of the library by those who are served by it;

"(4) acquisition of mechanisms and employment of personnel for the speedy transmission of materials from the regional library to local libraries in the geographic area served by the regional library; and

"(5) construction, renovation, rehabilitation, or expansion of physical plant considered necessary by such library to carry out its proper functions as a regional library.

"(c) (1) Grants under this section shall be made only to medical libraries which agree (A) to modify and increase their library resources so as to be able to provide supportive services to other libraries in the region as well as individual users of library services, (B) to provide free loan services to qualified users, and make available photoduplicated or facsimile copies of biomedical materials which qualified requesters may retain.

"(2) The Surgeon General, in awarding grants under this section, shall give priority to medical libraries having the greatest potential of fulfilling the needs for regional medical libraries. In determining the priority to be assigned to any medical library, he shall consider—

"(A) the need of such library, as determined by the levels of research, teaching, and medical activities of the library in relation to other existing library and medical communication services in the region;

"(B) the adequacy of the library (in terms of collections, personnel, equipment, and other facilities) as a basis for a regional medical library; and

"(C) the size and nature of the population to be served in the region in which the library is located.

"(d) Grants under this section for construction, renovation, rehabilitation, or expansion of physical plant shall be made in the same manner and subject to the same conditions as are provided for grants made under section 393, except that the eligibility for any such grant would be determined on the basis of the construction requirements of the library so as to be able to serve as a regional medical library. Grants under this section for basic resource materials to a library may not exceed 50 per centum of the library's annual operating expense (exclusive of Federal financial assistance under this part) for the preceding year; or in case of the first year in which the library receives a grant under this section for basic resource materials, 50 per centum of its average annual operating expenses over the past three years (or if it had been in operation for less than three years, its annual operating expenses determined by the Surgeon General in accordance with regulations prescribed by him).

"(e) Payment pursuant to grants made under this section may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement and in such installments as the Surgeon General shall prescribe by regulations after consultation with the Board.

"Financial support of biomedical scientific publications"

"Sec. 399. (a) In order to enable the Surgeon General to carry out the purposes of section 390(b) (7), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and ending with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, such sums, not to exceed

\$1,000,000 for any fiscal year, as may be necessary. Sums made available under this section shall be utilized by the Surgeon General, with the advice of the Board, in making grants to, and entering into appropriate contracts with, public or private nonprofit institutions of higher education and individual scientists for the purpose of supporting biomedical scientific publications of a nonprofit nature and to procure the compilation, writing, editing, and publication of reviews, abstracts, indices, handbooks, bibliographies, and related matter pertaining to scientific works and scientific developments.

"(b) Grants under this section in support of any single periodical publication may not be made for more than three years.

"(c) Payment pursuant to grants made under this section may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement and in such installments as the Surgeon General shall prescribe by regulations after consultation with the Board.

"Continuing availability of appropriated funds"

"Sec. 399a. Funds appropriated to carry out any of the purposes of this part for any fiscal year shall remain available for such purposes for the fiscal year immediately following the fiscal year for which they were appropriated.

"Records and audit"

"Sec. 399b. (a) Each recipient of a grant under this part shall keep such records as the Surgeon General shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such grant, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such grant is given or used, and the amount of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

"(b) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of such recipients that are pertinent to any grant received under the provisions of this part."

Regional branches of the National Library of Medicine

SEC. 3. Part H of title III of the Public Health Service Act which deals with the National Library of Medicine is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Regional branches of the National Library of Medicine"

"Sec. 378. (a) Whenever the Surgeon General, with the advice of the Board, determines that—

"(1) in any geographic area of the United States, there is no regional medical library adequate to serve such area;

"(2) under the criteria prescribed in section 398, there is a need for a regional medical library to serve such area; and

"(3) because there is located in such area no medical library which, under the provisions of section 398, can feasibly be developed into a regional medical library adequate to serve such area, he is authorized to establish, as a branch of the National Library of Medicine, a regional medical library to serve the needs of such area.

"(b) For the purpose of establishing branches of the National Library of Medicine under this section, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and ending with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, such sums, not to exceed \$2,000,000 for any fiscal year, as may be necessary. Sums appropriated pursuant to this section for any fiscal year shall remain available until expended."

Compensation of members of the board of regents of the National Library of Medicine

SEC. 4. Part H of title III of the Public Health Service Act which deals with the National Library of Medicine is amended by striking out, in section 373(d) thereof, "\$50" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$75".

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a program of grants to assist in meeting the need for adequate medical library services and facilities."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An Act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a program of grants to assist in meeting the need for adequate medical library services and facilities."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who wish to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the Record at the appropriate place on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

JEFFERSON NATIONAL EXPANSION MEMORIAL

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6519) to amend the act of May 17, 1954 (68 Stat. 98), as amended, providing for the construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial at the site of old St. Louis, Mo., and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 6519, with Mr. WELTNER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

H.R. 6519 is a bill introduced by the gentleman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN]. In addition to H.R. 6519 there are four other identical House bills: H.R. 6520, by Mr. KARSTEN; H.R. 6521, by Mr. CURTIS; H.R. 6522, by Mr. PRICE; and H.R. 6523, by Mr. CUNNINGHAM. An

identical Senate bill, S. 1576, passed the Senate June 17, 1965.

H.R. 6519 would increase the appropriation authorization for the completion of construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial at the site of the old St. Louis, Mo., from \$17,250,000 to \$23,250,000.

On June 15, 1934, the Congress established the U.S. Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission, to formulate plans for designing and constructing a permanent memorial to the westward expansion of the Nation. Actual clearing of the site of old St. Louis began in 1935 with a Federal appropriation of \$6,750,000 and \$2,250,000 contributed on a 3 to 1 matching basis by the city of St. Louis.

In 1947, the Commission chose a design—a museum, grand center steps, and visitor center design of Architect Eero Saarinen, dominated by a 630-foot-high stainless steel gateway arch facing the Mississippi River.

By the act of 1954, Congress authorized appropriations for the construction of the memorial. By this and subsequent actions, Congress has authorized and appropriated \$17,250,000 in Federal funds for the project, stipulating that expenditures be made on the basis of three Federal dollars for every one non-Federal—city of St. Louis and other sources—dollar made available. The city of St. Louis has assured the Park Service of its intent to continue to participate in sharing the cost of completion.

In order to complete the project a further expenditure of about \$8 million is needed on the same cost-sharing basis. The U.S. Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission, which includes in its membership Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, chairman; Senator WAYNE MORSE, Senator ROMAN HRUSKA, Representatives FRANK KARSTEN, WAYNE HAYS, and GLENN CUNNINGHAM, met in St. Louis, November 24, 1964. The Commission inspected the site, inquiring into all the details of the construction of the project, including costs, and passed unanimously a resolution requesting the Congress to authorize the appropriation of an additional \$6 million to be matched by \$2 million in additional funds to be supplied by the city of St. Louis and local contributions. The Commission found that without these additional funds this national memorial to commemorate the Nation's expansion westward could not be completed and made usable by the many visitors who will be attracted to the area.

In considering H.R. 6519, it is an important fact that the memorial must be finished in order to protect the already large investment that has been made in the project.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN].

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I consider it a great honor this afternoon to come before the Congress and ask for the consideration and passage of H.R. 6519 authorizing appropriations for \$6 million for work to be done on the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial. This, as you know, is a national project—not local. Under the terms of the Federal-

local participation agreement, St. Louis will match this additional \$6 million with \$2 million of local funds, just as all other funds provided for the memorial have been matched on a 3-to-1 basis by the city.

Mr. Chairman, many Members who have passed through St. Louis in the past year are familiar with the spectacular beauty of the plan designed by the late Eero Saarinen for the riverfront in St. Louis to memorialize the Louisiana Purchase, the Lewis and Clark Expedition, and the opening of the great American West. I hope every American will have a chance in his or her lifetime to see the sweep of the great arch that will be completed within the next several weeks.

This memorial is located on the banks of the Mississippi River and is in my congressional district. As a freshman Member of the House in 1954, it was one of my greatest honors to be accorded the privilege of sponsoring the legislation which authorized the memorial and the expenditure of Federal funds for construction work. It is this act of May 17, 1954, which this bill would amend, to increase the total authorization.

We have had some unusual engineering challenges in the construction of the magnificent arch—there has never been anything like this before in all engineering history. It is a breathtaking thing.

The authorization we are asking for today is to be spent as follows:

To complete the interior finish of the visitor center, Museum of Westward Expansion, and theater: \$2,706,000.

Exhibits and orientation film for Museum of Westward Expansion: \$1,300,000.

Subdrainage, grading, landscaping: \$3,028,000.

The grand center steps, 300 feet wide at bottom, 700 feet wide at top: \$921,000. Total needed: \$7,955,000.

This bill passed the Senate several months ago. Our State legislature has passed the enabling legislation so that St. Louis can provide its share of the funds. Generous donations have come from local businessmen. Also the trustees of the Albert P. Greensfelder Trusts have tendered a donation of \$750,000 to match the Federal funds of \$2,250,000 needed to complete the Museum of Westward Expansion.

Further evidence of the cooperative spirit that surrounds this project is the agreement of the Bi-State Development Agency to finance the approximately \$3,300,000 needed for the transportation system which will carry visitors from the underground center up through the legs of the gateway arch to the observation station at its summit.

This system, which Bi-State Development Agency will operate under an agreement with the National Park Service, will consist of two small trains, two elevators, and stairways, all within the legs of the arch.

I am sure that every Member of Congress would be as thrilled as I am if they could stand under this arch and look at this 630-foot high shining arch of stainless steel reaching up to the skies.

The railroad tracks which previously were elevated along this levee have been

depressed and are in a cut and fill. These are double-line railroad tracks serving the Terminal Railroad Association of St. Louis, major access into the railroad operations in St. Louis.

Rising in front is a grand center staircase. The framing for this staircase has been completed as a part of the work that has already been finished. There is an item of some \$900,000 in this program here for the completion of these grand center stair steps.

To the south, is a river overlook. This building has been completed, but the museum inside of it has not been completed. It is here in this museum that we propose to tell the story of river transportation and the part that river transportation played in the settlement and expansion of the West.

To the north, at the other end of the memorial, is another complementary river overlook, at which we propose to tell the story of railroad transportation and the part that the railroad played in the expansion of the West.

There are landscaped areas through here, and involving subdrainage as well as filling, grading, the planting of landscape material. The sum of \$3 million of this program is involved in the \$8 million, needed for completion.

As you approach the gateway arch, a model of which is here in front of you, you go underground at either side into the visitors' entrance. Here, in 12 galleries, we propose to tell the history of westward expansion, beginning with the Lewis and Clark Expedition of 1804, the miners' frontier, and all of the other frontiers that went into the settlement of the great western part of our Nation, culminating in a 12th and final gallery, at which we propose to tell the impact of this westward migration upon the influence, upon the heritage of our country and the influence that it had in shaping the great institutions of our country.

This gateway arch is a structure some 630 feet high, beginning 54 feet on all 3 sides, tapering to 17.5 feet thick at the top. It is a sandwich type of construction with carbon steel on the inside, stainless steel on the outside, filled with concrete to elevation of about 300 feet, and from there on, a hollow frame steel construction.

There will be underground in the visitors' center, a trainloading platform which will take passengers to the top of the arch, at which there is an observation platform and viewing windows on either side, accommodating about 240 people.

These trains will operate up and back in each direction in the summertime, when the crowds are expected—we expect they will operate up and deadhead back so as to move the visitors to the top of the observation platform.

The transportation system inside this arch is being financed by a revenue bond issue of the Bi-State Development Agency, created by compact between Missouri and Illinois for the development of transportation and other facilities in our great metropolitan area, and they have come forward with a revenue bond to finance and operate this train system inside the

arch so there is no cost involved to the Federal Government in the installation of this equipment.

There is a great open mall, extending westward to the old courthouse, which is to remain the principal headquarters for the memorial there, and this great mall extends on through to 21st Street and culminates at Washington University on the edge of the city of St. Louis.

I am certain this gateway arch will become one of the wonders of the world and will be as significant to the Middle West as the Pyramids have been to Egypt, Eiffel Tower to Paris, and the Washington Monument to our Nation's Capital.

We, in the St. Louis area, are thrilled beyond words that the completion of this arch, with the two giant arched legs meeting at the top, will be accomplished within the next 2 weeks. There remains to be completed the items mentioned for which additional matching funds are being requested. I am grateful for the enthusiastic assistance we have received in making this spectacular project possible. Without the authorization contained in this legislation, we would have this magnificent arch located within a sea of mud—and the beauty of the scene from a distance would be marred by ugliness at close range.

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Chairman, I know the hour is late, but I should like to take just a moment to join my colleague, the distinguished gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] in urging the approval of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, my interest in this project is twofold. First, as a St. Louisan, I have a very deep, personal interest in seeing the memorial completed.

But my second interest rests on a somewhat different foundation. For over 15 years, it has been my privilege to serve as a Member of the U.S. Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission. This Commission, which is composed of Members of the House, the other body, and the public, is charged by law with the responsibility for the development of the memorial to Thomas Jefferson on the banks of the Mississippi River in St. Louis, Mo.

The Commission last met in November 1964, in St. Louis, to inspect the project and examine plans for the final phases of its completion. We found that construction has generally proceeded on schedule but that funds were not available for four major components of the memorial.

The first of these items is the visitors' center, the museum and theater, which are located in the underground structure beneath the legs of the arch. About \$2.7 million will be needed to complete the structure.

The second item comprises the exhibits for the museum. This is about 30 percent complete and an additional amount of \$1.3 million will be required for the remainder.

The third item includes grading, landscaping, and drainage, and for this funds

in the amount of about \$3 million will be required.

Finally, a series of steps are planned to link the memorial to the land and the Mississippi River. The cost of this item will be a little over \$900,000.

During the meeting of the Commission a resolution was unanimously adopted requesting the Congress to authorize the appropriation of the additional funds provided in this bill. Under the financing formula, the Federal Government will contribute these funds, to which the city of St. Louis will add an additional \$2 million.

I cannot conceive that the House would let this memorial go unfinished and I urge my colleagues to favorably consider the pending legislation, which will enable the completion of the project in a manner which will be fitting and proper for a memorial of such great significance as this one.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as is necessary.

Mr. Chairman, as pointed out by the gentleman from Missouri, this bill was passed out of the Committee on House Administration unanimously. We were perfectly willing to go along with the additional \$6 million in authorizations. This project has been in progress since 1934. It has been determined that approximately \$8 million more is needed to finish the job—\$6 million of this will be Federal funds and the other \$2 million will be contributed by non-Federal sources. I believe it should be pointed out at this time, as an example to this Congress, that we should watch this type thing in the future when we work on authorization bills.

We originally authorized \$17,250,000. Now several years later we have to come back and ask for another \$6 million to finish the job. I think it would be well in the future on all authorization bills to find out specifically what the costs are going to be so that we will not have to authorize additional funds.

Mr. Chairman, I support this measure. This is going to be a worthwhile project upon completion. It will be worthy of our country. At the same time I hope that in the future on authorization bills of this nature we will get better cost figures so that we can do a better job in authorizing the money.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I was not here when this measure was passed earlier but I find it difficult to understand how they could miss it by \$6 million. Is there any explanation? I am trying to get a little information about what caused the miscalculation as to the cost.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, the project was originally started in 1934 under an Executive order by President Roosevelt. It was one of the public works programs with an original authorization of \$6,750,000. In 1954 the Congress authorized for appropriation \$17,250,000. It has taken a long time to put this project into effect and in the meantime costs of construction have risen over 31 percent.

This is one of the problems in the increase of authorization requests. Maybe the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN], who is familiar with this project, could answer further in this regard.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. The answer the gentleman gave is absolutely correct. The first appropriation authorization was back in 1956 or 1957. Prices have risen. We were able to construct the arch itself and the building underneath, but we have not been able to construct the landscaping and finish the visitors' center. As I described at the end of my remarks the arch as finished is just in a sea of mud. It is not going to do any good unless we have the museum and the other things which are going to tell the story of the trek to the West. This was the reason for the memorial in the first place.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the lady's explanation. Could there be any explanation after this 30-year period of the extravagance in the cost of building this arch? What is the explanation for finding this operation in a mud hole instead of being completed as I assume the project initially should have been completed in a period of less than 30 years?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. There were the delays of World War II and other causes on which money had to be spent instead of spending it on a memorial. So we very graciously delayed our request for authorizations until 1954 when the first authorization was made.

Mr. WATSON. So actually there has been no change in the plans for the arch itself?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. No. I want to say that this is the first and only kind of arch or monument of this type that has ever been built. It is one of the most interesting things in the country. May I say that when this arch and its appurtenances are finished it will stand out like the Pyramids of Egypt or the Eiffel Tower of Paris or the Washington Monument in the Nation's Capital.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman's explanation of why it has been in this long process of building. I hope it will stand out as she believes.

But, I think it might be helpful to the House of Representatives and to the Committee on House Administration if we know the name of the architect. Anyone who can miss the cost of a building by \$6 million, when he estimated it would cost \$17 million initially, I do not believe we would need his architectural services in the future.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. He is now deceased. His name is Saarinen and he enjoyed world renown.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I was privileged to be appointed as one

of the three Members of the House to serve on this Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission. I am familiar with the project. It is a great project. It needs \$6 million more from us in order to be completed. We cannot have this thing dangling in the air.

So, Mr. Chairman, I hope that this House will overwhelmingly approve this request. This happens to be something of historical significance and I, for one Member, believe in perpetuating our historic ancestors and what they did. This has to do with the Louisiana Purchase, and that affects my State and affects many States in the Union.

Mr. Chairman, I have gone over this very carefully and I do not believe it represents an unusual request. Prices have gone up, and I certainly hope this legislation will be approved.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Could the gentleman answer a question? The time period of 1954-55 has been used several times in relation to this project. It runs through my mind that this is about the same time that the Rayburn House Office Building was authorized. Would it be possible that the same person who made the estimate on this arch also made the estimate on the Rayburn Building?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. The gentleman from Ohio would know as well as I.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I hope we may have some assurance today from some proponent of this bill or resolution that this will be the last call upon the Federal Treasury for funds with respect to this memorial. I wonder if we could have that assurance?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from California yield to me to respond to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I shall be glad to give that assurance. I have pointed out in my remarks that I have extended in the Record and have explained the fact that we have had large contributions from our business concerns in St. Louis toward the construction of this project and who want to see this project completed. We have had, for instance, a \$750,000 contribution from a large trust fund with which to work in placing the items in the museum.

We have also had our State finance commission to advance \$3½ million to finish the transportation inside the arch. When the arch was initially under consideration and after the bids had come in, they were so much higher than had been anticipated that there was no money left for the transportation system to take the visitors up to the observation tower. So revenue bonds were authorized to be sold in order to build the transportation system inside the arch which eventually the visitors will

use in going up the arch and will pay off these bonds.

Mr. Chairman, I can assure the gentleman from Iowa that no more funds are going to be requested from the Government. The city of St. Louis has put up its share on the basis of 1 to 3 in this Federal-local contribution project and we are ready to move as soon as we have this authorizing legislation.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Missouri for the assurance that she has given to the Members of the House that this will be the last time around.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VIGORITO].

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Chairman, the first time I was in Paris I saw the Eiffel Tower there and in my opinion it was a steel monstrosity. That is exactly what I think of this arch going up in St. Louis. It is a steel monstrosity. I am appalled to find out we are spending millions of dollars for this ridiculous thing. Would it not be cheaper to take an old battleship left over from World War II and stand it on end? It would save us a lot of money. This is ridiculous.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VIGORITO] yields back 1 minute.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] yield to me so that I may ask another question?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WATSON. From the tenor of the questions I asked earlier, it might be assumed that I have some mixed feelings about this measure—and the assumption is correct. But do I understand correctly, the gentleman to say that you are going to have an elevator in this arch?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Yes, sir; there will be an elevator.

Mr. WATSON. My concern is that if it has taken so long to complete it as they have thus far, if any of us have the privilege to go out there, it will take an elevator for us to get up there. With that assurance, I will go along and I hope that eventually it will be completed.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. We will give you a free pass on the elevator.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support H.R. 6519, a bill to amend the act of 1964 providing for the construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial in St. Louis, Mo.

As a member of the Missouri delegation in the House of Representatives such support could be expected. Let me hasten to point out, however, that the great arch to be built on the banks of the Mississippi River is not for Missouri alone. It is a permanent memorial to the westward expansion of our Nation. It is a memorial to the Louisiana Purchase and the growth that followed in

the Mississippi and Missouri Valleys. Finally, it is a national memorial to those many persons who made possible this territorial expansion of the United States, and their leader, President Thomas Jefferson.

This project enjoys support far beyond the boundaries of Missouri. We have heard favorable comments made by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], who agreed that his great State of Nebraska and other States were honored by this same memorial. It is noteworthy that the U.S. Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission that met in St. Louis in November 1964 to inspect the details of the construction of the project quite appropriately contained Members of the other body from both Nebraska and Oregon as well as our colleague in the House from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

If I were not a Missourian, upon reading the report from the Committee on House Administration, I would support H.R. 6519. The reason is that there has been heretofore authorized and appropriated \$17 million in Federal funds. This additional \$6 million required now is not the fault of anyone including that great architect, Eero Saarinen, now deceased. It is a fact of life that since 1934 construction costs have gone up approximately 31 percent.

If I were not a member of the Missouri delegation, I would support this bill because I could see this project has been supported financially by the city of St. Louis and other local sources. Large amounts have already been contributed by local sources. An additional \$750,000 will be contributed by the Alfred Greensder trust fund. Another \$3½ million will be raised by the Bi-State Commission—Missouri-Illinois—through their issuance of revenue bonds to provide for elevator transportation inside of the arch. This will come from the sale of revenue bonds to be paid off from admissions charged to visitors.

Even if I were not a Missourian I would be able to observe from the facts that it is just plain commonsense as well as good business to have this additional authorization of \$6 million to complete an arch in which the Federal Government has an existing investment of \$17 million. Although the arch might be completed with present funds, in bad weather its base would be surrounded by a sea of mud and there would be no shelter for visitors or housing for a museum.

Mr. Chairman, the author of H.R. 6519 is the gentlelady from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN]. She is to be highly commended for her interest in this project and the manner in which she has presented the facts, pointing out the necessity for this additional appropriation authorization. It is not an easy task to have to come back and ask for supplemental funds for a project which is so near completion. She has done an outstanding job in pointing out that the shortage of funds is not the fault of anyone, that construction costs have risen since authorization. She has emphasized there has been no extravagance; she has underscored the fact that any

businessman faced with a similar problem would invest an equivalent sum to complete a business project in which \$17 million had already been invested.

All of us from Missouri salute the gentlewoman from St. Louis for her efforts today. While she has presented her case with logic and persuasiveness, her personal popularity among her colleagues has been proven by indications of support from both sides of the aisle. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KASTEN], also deserves a pat on the back for his perseverance in bringing this matter to the attention of the Congress.

As a Missourian, I am of course proud of this great stainless steel arch. But every American can share in this pride. This huge stainless steel parabolic arch facing the Mississippi River which will house elevators to carry passengers to a summit observatory is unique. It is the only such arch in the world. It will stand out like the Eiffel Tower in Paris or the Pyramids in Egypt or like our own Washington Monument in the Nation's Capital. Mention of the Washington Monument brings to mind the fact this great arch can best be visualized by imagining two Washington Monuments leaning toward each other and joined together by a parabolic arch. This will give one an idea of the majesty of this great arch.

It is a real privilege, Mr. Chairman, to support H.R. 6519, knowing its passage will permit the completion of this beautiful curved structure of stainless steel as a fitting national memorial to our territorial expansion through the Louisiana Purchase and standing symbolical as the gateway to the West.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 6519

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of May 17, 1954 (68 Stat. 98), entitled "An Act to provide for the construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial at the site of old Saint Louis, Missouri, in general accordance with the plan approved by the United States Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission, and for other purposes," as amended by the Act of September 6, 1958 (72 Stat. 1794), is hereby further amended by striking the figure "\$17,250,000" from section 4 thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "\$23,250,000."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have one further question. I wonder if the President will sign this bill at the top of the arch?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I hope he does. I invite the President now to come to St. Louis for that purpose.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRASER

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRASER: On page 2, line 2, substitute a semicolon for the period and add the following proviso: "Provided, That this increase in authorization shall not become effective until and unless there shall have been a reduction in the

national debt, and the Congress shall have curtailed appropriations to the extent that a balanced budget has been maintained for 2 consecutive fiscal years after the effective date of this act."

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I was on the floor of the House yesterday during one of the sessions of the Committee of the Whole and heard an eloquent speech in support of an amendment substantially in the same form as the amendment I have just offered. It was such a good amendment that I thought it deserved to be offered today in connection with another opportunity to try to protect and preserve the fiscal integrity of the Government of the United States.

I do not know if the gentleman from Missouri has any comments to make about this amendment, but whatever the gentleman has to say, I am sure the Committee will be glad to hear him.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. If the Members just vote on this amendment like they vote on my amendments, I will be satisfied.

Mr. FRASER. I wonder if the gentleman from Missouri would answer a question then. Are you opposed to this amendment?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. This is not my bill. Of course, you understand I am acting for the committee and I have brought the bill to you and have tried to give you a frank explanation of the matter. We have \$17 million already invested here. It is just like being in a crap game. If I had \$17,000 sunk in a game, I am going to risk \$6,000 more to get out of the game. That is what we have to do here.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRASER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CORMAN. I will say to the gentleman, I sincerely hope that this amendment is defeated because I fear that we would have an awful lot of years to beat our feet in the Mississippi mud.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think a little legislative history might be of interest. Members might like to know that I offered an amendment similar to this on several measures in the last 2 years. I would like to make a little legislative history here. The original Gateway amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] had the very language of this amendment in it.

It was as a result of studying the history of the Gateway amendment, which I believe was the forefather of the arch, that I got the idea for the amendment based upon a balanced budget. I think the gentleman has struck the right note at the right time on the right piece of legislation.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRASER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I should like to say to the gentleman from Illinois that the

gentleman from Missouri did offer that amendment. I believe it was in 1956, the first time that President Eisenhower announced that the budget would be balanced. We immediately asked for the first funds that were given and authorized for this project. So we lived up to that agreement.

I do not believe that this amendment is necessary now. It is my bill. I do not think we have faltered in what we have tried to accomplish in building this great memorial to the West. I urge defeat of the amendment.

Mr. FINDLEY. If the gentleman will yield further, perhaps we need another Republican President to balance the budget.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great interest to the words of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES]. His eloquence persuades me that I was in error in offering the amendment. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I am in full sympathy with the gentleman who proposed this amendment, regardless of his motives. But I might say, perhaps for his satisfaction—and it gives me a little satisfaction—I have heard discussion of this arch in St. Louis. If we continue spending as we have this year and in the past, we need not worry about it. Before the money is spent and the arch is completed, this country will either be busted or the budget will be balanced. So I do not think we need worry about what will happen.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WELTNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6519) to amend the act of May 17, 1954 (68 Stat. 98), as amended, providing for the construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial at the site of Old St. Louis, Mo., and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 581, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 250, nays 12, answered "present" 1, not voting 168, as follows:

[Roll No. 350]

YEAS—250

Abernethy	Andrews,	Arends
Albert	N. Dak.	Ashbrook

Ashley	Gray	O'Konski	Colmer	Henderson	Powell	Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Cahill.
Ashmore	Green, Pa.	Oison, Minn.	Cooley	Holfield	Purcell	Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Mathias.
Ayres	Greigg	O'Neal, Ga.	Corbett	Holland	Quillen	Mr. Matthews with Mr. Walker of Mississippi.
Baldwin	Grider	O'Neill, Mass.	Curtis	Hosmer	Race	Mr. Kee with Mr. Tupper.
Bandstra	Griffin	Passman	Daniels	Johnson, Calif.	Redlin	Mr. Johnson of California with Mr. Utt.
Baring	Grover	Patman	Dawson	Johnson, Okla.	Reid, N.Y.	Mr. Grabowski with Mr. Clancy.
Bates	Gubser	Patten	Delaney	Jonas	Resnick	Mr. Holfield with Mr. Hosmer.
Beckworth	Gurney	Pelly	Dent	Kee	Reuss	Mr. Hardy with Mr. Derwinski.
Belcher	Hagan, Ga.	Pepper	Derwinski	Keith	Rhodes, Ariz.	Mr. Purcell with Mr. Goodell.
Bell	Hagen, Calif.	Perkins	Devine	Kelly	Rivers, S.C.	Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Carter.
Bennett	Haley	Pickle	Diggs	Keogh	Rivers, Alaska	Mr. Roncalio with Mr. Burton of Utah.
Berry	Hall	Pike	Donohue	Kirwan	Roncalio	Mr. Kornegay with Mr. Quillen.
Betts	Halpern	Poage	Dorn	Kluczynski	Rostenkowski	Mr. Henderson with Mr. Jonas.
Bingham	Hamilton	Poff	Dow	Kornegay	Roudebush	Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Battin.
Blatnik	Hanna	Price	Downing	Krebs	St. Onge	Mr. George W. Andrews with Mr. Brock.
Boland	Hansen, Idaho	Pucinski	Duncan, Oreg.	Laird	Schlisler	Mr. Carey with Mr. Fino.
Bow	Harvey, Ind.	Quile	Dwyer	Latta	Scott	Mr. Celler with Mr. Halleck.
Brademas	Harvey, Mich.	Randall	Dyal	Lennon	Shipley	Mr. Dow with Mr. Morse.
Brooks	Hathaway	Reid, Ill.	Edmondson	Lindsay	Sikes	Mr. Sweeney with Mr. May.
Brown, Calif.	Hechler	Reifel	Erlenborn	Long, La.	Sisk	Mr. Morris with Mr. Martin of Alabama.
Broyhill, Va.	Helstoski	Reinecke	Evins, Tenn.	McCulloch	Slack	Mr. Boggs with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.
Buchanan	Herlong	Rhodes, Pa.	Fallon	McDowell	Smith, Iowa	Mr. Multer with Mrs. Dwyer.
Burke	Hicks	Roberts	Fino	Macdonald	Smith, Va.	Mr. Murphy with Mr. Corbett.
Burleson	Horton	Rodino	Flynt	MacGregor	Steed	Mr. Donohue with Mr. Adair.
Burton, Calif.	Howard	Rogers, Colo.	Fogarty	Madden	Stratton	Mr. Philbin with Mr. MacGregor.
Byrne, Pa.	Hull	Rogers, Fla.	Foley	Martin, Ala.	Sweeney	Mr. Race with Mr. Erlenborn.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hungate	Rogers, Tex.	Ford, Gerald R.	Martin, Mass.	Taylor	Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Mosher.
Cabell	Huot	Ronan	Frelinghuysen	Mathias	Tenzer	Mr. Reuss with Mr. Curtis.
Callan	Hutchinson	Rooney, N.Y.	Fuqua	Matthews	Thomas	Mr. Steed with Mr. Holland.
Casey	Ichord	Rooney, Pa.	Gallagher	May	Thompson, N.J.	Mr. Morrison with Mr. O'Brien.
Cederberg	Irwin	Rosenthal	Garmatz	Michel	Thompson, Tex.	Mr. O'Hara of Michigan with Mr. Nix.
Chamberlain	Jacobs	Roush	Gilligan	Mize	Todd	Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Resnick.
Chelf	Jarman	Roybal	Goodell	Morris	Toll	Mr. Powell with Mr. Duncan of Oregon.
Clausen	Jennings	Ryan	Grabowski	Morrison	Tunney	Mr. Evins with Mr. Fallon.
Don H.	Johnson, Pa.	Satterfield	Green, Oreg.	Morse	Tupper	Mr. Dyal with Mr. Downing.
Clawson, Del.	Jones, Ala.	St Germain	Griffiths	Mosher	Utt	Mr. Diggs with Mr. Hawkins.
Cleveland	Jones, Mo.	Saylor	Halleck	Multer	Walker, Miss.	Mr. Dorn with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma.
Cohelan	Karsten	Scheuer	Hansen, Iowa	Nix	Watkins	Mr. Flynt with Mr. Olsen of Montana.
Conte	Karth	Schmidhauser	Hansen, Wash.	O'Brien	Watts	Mr. Foley with Mr. Dawson.
Conyers	Kastenmeier	Schneebeli	Hardy	O'Hara, Mich.	Weitner	
Corman	King, Calif.	Schwelker	Harris	Olsen, Mont.	Whitten	
Craley	King, N.Y.	Secrest	Harsha	Ottinger	Willis	
Cramer	King, Utah	Selden	Hawkins	Philbin	Wilson, Bob	
Culver	Kunkel	Senner	Hays	Pirnie	Wyatt	
Cunningham	Landrum	Shriver	Hébert	Pool	Wydler	
Curtin	Langen	Sickles			Yates	
Daddario	Leggett	Skubitz				
Dague	Lipscomb	Smith, Calif.				
Davis, Ga.	Long, Md.	Smith, N.Y.				
Davis, Wis.	Love	Springer				
de la Garza	McCarthy	Stafford				
Denton	McClory	Staggers				
Dickinson	McDade	Staibaum				
Dingell	McFall	Stanton				
Dole	McGrath	Stephens				
Dowdy	McMillan	Stubblefield				
Dulski	McVicker	Sullivan				
Duncan, Tenn.	Machen	Talcott				
Edwards, Ala.	Mackay	Teague, Calif.				
Edwards, Calif.	Mackie	Teague, Tex.				
Ellsworth	Mahon	Thomson, Wis.				
Evans, Colo.	Maillard	Trimble				
Everett	Marsh	Tuck				
Farbstein	Martin, Nebr.	Tuten				
Farnsley	Matsunaga	Udall				
Farnum	Meeds	Ullman				
Fascell	Miller	Van Deerlin				
Feighan	Mills	Vanik				
Fisher	Minish	Vivian				
Flood	Mink	Waggonner				
Ford	Minshall	Walker, N. Mex.				
William D.	Moeller	Whalley				
Fountain	Monagan	White, Idaho				
Fraser	Moorhead	White, Tex.				
Friedel	Morgan	Whitener				
Fulton, Pa.	Morton	Widnall				
Fulton, Tenn.	Moss	Wilson				
Gathings	Murphy, Ill.	Charles H.				
Gettys	Murray	Wright				
Gialmo	Natcher	Young				
Gibbons	Nedzi	Younger				
Gilbert	Nelsen	Zablocki				
Gonzalez	O'Hara, Ill.					

NAYS—12

Conable	McEwen	Vigorito
Findley	Moore	Watson
Gross	Robison	Williams
Joelson	Rumsfeld	Wolff

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Coilier

NOT VOTING—168

Abbitt	Annunzio	Broyhill, N.C.
Adair	Aspinall	Burton, Utah
Adams	Barrett	Cahill
Addabbo	Battin	Callaway
Anderson, Ill.	Boggs	Cameron
Anderson, Tenn.	Bolling	Carey
Andrews	Bolton	Carter
George W.	Bonner	Celler
Andrews	Bray	Clancy
Glenn	Brock	Clark
	Broomfield	Clevenger

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Slack with Mr. Roudebush.	Mr. Sikes with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Wyatt.	Mr. Barlett with Mr. Keith.
Mr. Thomas with Mr. McCulloch.	Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Yates with Mr. Wylder.	Mr. Adams with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Latta.	Mr. Daniels with Mr. Broyhill of North Carolina.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Watkins.	Mr. Cameron with Mr. Bray.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Harsha.	Mr. Edmondson with Mrs. Griffiths.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Glenn Andrews.	Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Garmatz.
Mr. Tenzer with Mr. Lindsay.	Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.	Mr. Ottinger with Mr. Redlin.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Pirnie.	Mr. Hanley with Mr. Hansen of Iowa.
Mr. Schlisler with Mr. Mize.	Mr. Whitten with Mr. Tunney.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Michel.	Mr. Toll with Mr. McDowell.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Keith.	Mr. Lennon with Mr. Macdonald.
Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Frelinghuysen.	Mr. Krebs with Mr. Kluczynski.
Mr. Adams with Mr. Devine.	Mr. Hays with Mr. Harris.
Mr. Daniels with Mr. Broyhill of North Carolina.	Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Cameron with Mr. Bray.	Mr. Shipley with Mr. Smith of Virginia.
Mr. Edmondson with Mrs. Griffiths.	Mr. Taylor with Mr. Todd.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Garmatz.	Mr. Weltner with Mr. Madden.
Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Gallagher.	Mr. Dent with Mr. Cooley.
Mr. Ottinger with Mr. Redlin.	Mr. Clark with Mr. Bonner.
Mr. Hanley with Mr. Hansen of Iowa.	Mr. Annunzio with Mr. Abbitt.
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Tunney.	Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Joelson.
Mr. Toll with Mr. McDowell.	Mr. Keogh with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Lennon with Mr. Macdonald.	Mr. Hébert with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Krebs with Mr. Kluczynski.	Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Laird.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Harris.	Mrs. Kelly with Mrs. Bolton.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Scott.	Mr. Gilligan with Mr. Reid of New York.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Smith of Virginia.	Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Todd.	Mr. Colmer with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Weltner with Mr. Madden.	Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Callaway.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Cooley.	
Mr. Clark with Mr. Bonner.	
Mr. Annunzio with Mr. Abbitt.	
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Joelson.	

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 1576) to amend the act of May 17, 1954 (68 Stat. 98), as amended, providing for the construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial at the site of old St. Louis, Mo., and for other purposes, an identical Senate bill to the bill just passed by the House, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 1576

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of May 17, 1954 (68 Stat. 98), entitled "An Act to provide for the construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial at the site of old Saint Louis, Missouri, in general accordance with the plan approved by the United States Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission, and for other purposes," as amended by the Act of September 6, 1958 (72 Stat. 1794), is hereby further amended by striking the figure "\$17,250,000" from section 4 thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "\$23,250,000."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and

passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H.R. 6519, was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks prior to the vote on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time in order to ask the majority leader if he will announce the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, before announcing the program, will the gentleman from Illinois yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Consent Calendar and the authority for the Speaker to recognize for motions to suspend the rules, in order on Monday, October 4, 1965, may be transferred to Tuesday, October 5, 1965.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the gentleman would withhold his request until we get an announcement of the bills to be called.

Mr. ALBERT. This is a part of the announcement. There will be business on Tuesday, and I shall announce the program. What the unanimous-consent request is, is that the Consent Calendar and suspensions be put over from Monday to Tuesday.

Mr. GROSS. Can we not have the list of bills before the unanimous-consent request is made?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

The SPEAKER. The request is withdrawn.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the request of the gentleman from Illinois, the program for next week is as follows:

Monday, subject to a unanimous-consent agreement, there will be no session.

On Tuesday, we plan to call the Consent Calendar and the Private Calendar, after which there will be eight suspensions:

Senate Joint Resolution 106, USIA film "John F. Kennedy—Years of Lighting, Day of Drums";

H.R. 9495, Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission;

H.R. 318, imposition of tire tax on tires delivered to manufacturers retail outlet;

H.R. 11029, tariff treatment of certain wool fabrics;

H.R. 10327, providing for operators of ocean carriers by water between the United States, its possessions and territories, and foreign countries to file evidence of financial security and other information

S. 2118, ship mortgage bonds;

S. 2232, captioned films for the deaf; and

H.R. 10774, permissible uses of jointly administered union trust funds.

For Wednesday, there are six unanimous-consent bills, unanimously reported from the Committee on Ways and Means. Those, of course, are subject to objection. They are as follows:

H.R. 327, exempting from taxation certain nonprofit corporations and associations operated to provide reserve funds for domestic building and loan associations;

H.R. 7723, suspension of duty, certain tropical hardwoods;

H.R. 8210, amending the International Organizations Immunities Act;

H.R. 8436, dutiable status of watches, clocks, et cetera, from insular possessions of the United States;

H.R. 8445, retired pay, Tax Court judges; and

H.R. 11216, tariff treatment of articles assembled abroad.

On Wednesday, there will also be Senate Joint Resolution 32, authorizing a contribution to certain inhabitants of the Ryukyu Islands.

On Wednesday, also, it is planned to consider the bill H.R. 2020, relating to the southern Nevada water project, Nevada.

I am going to ask permission later to put over any nonprocedural rollcall votes from Tuesday and Wednesday to Thursday.

For Thursday and the balance of the week, it is planned to take up S. 2084, the Highway Beautification Act of 1965, with an open rule, 4 hours of debate, making the committee substitute in order, to be read for amendments by titles instead of by sections.

Also it is planned to take up H.R. 11135, the Sugar Act Amendments of 1965, under a closed rule, waiving points of order, making in order to be offered two amendments by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY], with 4 hours of general debate.

This program, of course, is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time, and that any further program may be announced later.

I also make the usual statement, with respect to suspensions, that they may not necessarily be called up in the order in which they have been announced.

CALL OF CONSENT CALENDAR AND AUTHORITY FOR SPEAKER TO RECOGNIZE MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE TRANSFERRED FROM MONDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1965, TO TUESDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1965

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the

Consent Calendar and the authority for the Speaker to recognize for motions to suspend the rules, in order for Monday, October 4, 1965, may be transferred to Tuesday, October 5, 1965.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ROLLCALL VOTES ON TUESDAY OR WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 5 OR 6, TO BE PUT OVER TO THURSDAY, OCTOBER 7

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any rollcall votes, other than on questions of procedure, which may be demanded on either Tuesday or Wednesday, October 5 or 6, be put over until October 7.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, that means that any rollcalls that might be in order on this list of suspensions would be carried over with no assurance whatever that we could get a rollcall vote under circumstances that might exist on Tuesday.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct. The only reason I make the request, as the gentleman knows, is that Tuesday and Wednesday of next week are religious days.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that, but the gentleman has scheduled a substantial program of business for Tuesday.

Mr. ALBERT. I understand most of these have been unanimously reported.

Mr. GROSS. Not all the suspensions have been unanimously reported. I can tell the gentleman that the first resolution was not unanimously reported.

Mr. ALBERT. I understand that most of them have been. I have not checked that, but I have been so advised.

Mr. ARENDS. I believe what the gentleman is worried about is that the unfinished business might not get a vote. I believe the majority leader can assure us as if a bill is objected to it will go over, and he can assure us we will have a vote.

Mr. ALBERT. Of course, that would be subject to the action of the House. So far as I personally am concerned, the gentleman can have a vote. But I cannot take over the prerogatives of the House.

Mr. GROSS. This is my very real concern.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman knows that.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman must understand, and I am sure he does, the position of any individual Member of the House who might want a rollcall vote on a bill. The bill, being susceptible under other circumstances to a rollcall vote, the Member might lose that right as a Member of the House to such vote when action is postponed to another day.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman would not want to take advantage of a Member's fulfilling a religious obligation, who for that reason could not be here. Would the gentleman want to do that?

Mr. GROSS. Not at all.

I do not wish to prolong this discussion. I have no desire to argue with the distinguished majority leader, but I wonder why there must be a schedule of business if we are going to observe religious holidays or any other holidays. Why should we schedule business of a serious nature at that time?

Mr. ALBERT. I ask the gentleman to yield further for a brief statement. This is the first time this year we have requested that rollcalls be put over.

Mr. GROSS. I understand.

Mr. ALBERT. Second, we are trying to enable Members to observe the religious holidays without interfering with our attempt to reach an adjournment date as soon as possible.

Mr. GROSS. I will go along with the gentleman once more, and let us see how it works out.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman. I appreciate that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, if I may continue, I ask the gentleman from Oklahoma, looking down the road a little way, if he can say anything about the following week. Is it anticipated there will be called up the minimum wage bill on the following Monday?

Mr. ALBERT. I cannot answer the gentleman.

Mr. ARENDS. With the completion of this calendar we shall have about reached the bottom of the barrel. Every barrel has a bottom.

Mr. ALBERT. We are certainly well on the way to the bottom of the barrel.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS DISPENSED WITH

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

A BRIGHT SPOT ON THE HORIZON

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, we are having our troubles in Latin America. The impression that we are once again reverting to the early 20th century role of the colossus of the North, or to use a more current expression "Mr. Big", has been gaining ground, particularly because of the adoption by this House of House Resolution 560. I hope that steps will be taken shortly to correct the unfortunate impression created by that resolution.

However, there is one bright spot on the horizon, insofar as our relations with Latin America are concerned, and that bright spot is the President's statesmanlike handling of the negotiations with Panama.

Colonialism is a dirty word in the world these days. Rightly or wrongly, that term has been applied over the years in Latin America to our role in Panama and in the Canal Zone.

From my father, the late Senator Hiram Bingham, of Connecticut, who was a great expert on Latin America, I learned something of the sensitivity of Latin Americans to any suggestion that the inter-American system was not a true partnership, but a system of satellites dominated by one great power. Although I certainly do not pretend to be an expert myself, I have learned more about this sensitivity in my visits to almost all the Latin American countries and in dealing with Latin American delegates at the United Nations and other international conferences.

If we are to build and preserve the friendship of our Latin American neighbors, we cannot overlook this sensitivity. The Panama Canal Zone and our existing treaty with Panama have become a hated symbol throughout Latin America of a one-sided relationship. That is why I believe the President deserves our strong support in carrying through these delicate negotiations with Panama to a successful conclusion.

From the crisis of January 1964 to the present, the President's handling of our delicate and critical problems with Panama has been marked by courage, foresight, and statesmanship.

Our relationship with Panama has always been uniquely close. Unfortunately, in recent years this relationship has been marred by violent conflict stemming from Panamanian dissatisfaction over the treaty arrangements which govern the operation of the canal and the Canal Zone. The present canal treaty negotiations represent an effort by both nations to eliminate the causes of conflict between them and to eliminate the threat posed by this conflict to the efficient operation of the canal.

So much of our attention in foreign relations is focused on emergencies these days that it is refreshing to learn of a great constructive achievement: the joint announcement just made by the President of the United States and the President of Panama that our two countries will share in the operation of the Panama Canal. This announcement should demonstrate that a big country and a small country can work together effectively in partnership and that treaty arrangements can be negotiated that will respond to the differing needs of both countries.

The United States and many other nations of the world are interested in the economy and speed of moving vessels and cargo from one ocean to the other—in other words, in the effective operation vital parts of the economy of Panama. shares this interest wholeheartedly as the host country where the canal has been operated efficiently for over 50 years. But the canal and the commer-

cial and defense activity that accompanies its operation have been and are vital parts of the economy of Panama. Therefore, it is logical and right that Panama should share in the management and operation of the canal and that the activities of all kinds related to this operation should be more integrated than they have been in the life of the Panamanian community.

The U.S. citizens and Panamanian citizens and a few of other nationalities are providing efficient, dependable, and skillful services in the operation and protection of the Panama Canal. It is reassuring to them and to us that the two Presidents, in issuing their announcement, have given recognition to the important responsibilities of both countries to safeguard the rights and interests of the employees of all nationalities. We hope that the new kind of partnership between Panama and the United States will prove to be as fruitful for all the employees as it will be for the two nations.

As the President clearly stated on December 18, 1964, the United States is willing to do all possible to recognize Panama's just aspirations, but we must also continue to discharge our responsibility to the world to guarantee the continued availability of an interoceanic canal open to the ships of all nations. It is most encouraging to note from the contents of the recent joint United States-Panamanian statement on the course of the negotiations that Panama is equally aware of its responsibility to cooperate in providing an efficiently run and adequately defended international waterway for the use of world commerce. I applaud the progress which has already been made in these vital negotiations and express my hope that they can rapidly be brought to a mutually satisfactory conclusion.

SUGAR LOOT TO HAITI'S DICTATOR

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the sugar bill as presently drafted will give Haiti's dictator, Dr. Francois Duvalier, access to over \$10 million in loot.

Haiti's sugar lobbyist, a New Yorker who heads the Haytian-American Sugar Co., is not properly registered with the U.S. Justice Department as required by the Foreign Agents Registration Act.

For some unaccountable reason the House Agricultural Committee increased the already too-generous U.S. sugar quota allotted to Duvalier's regime.

Haiti, an unhappy land ruled by the worst tyrant in the Western Hemisphere, gets a big slice of the sugar pie.

This fact alone raises serious question about the sugar bill which comes to the House floor next week.

Haiti's dictator stays in power by means of a continuing reign of terror.

His regime is as notorious for graft as it is for brutality. It is beyond belief that the huge profits in U.S. sugar quotas have escaped his notice. To siphon them off, he needs to deal with only one company. Haiti's sugar industry is virtually a monopoly, controlled by the Haytian-American Sugar Co., with offices in New York.

In its present form, the sugar bill will hand Duvalier's regime an annual quota of 28,782 tons—guaranteed for 5 years. The U.S. sugar market brings nearly three times the world price, and at present prices, the proposed quota carries a 5-year premium value of \$10,053,700.

Assuming the Haytian-American Sugar Co., can at least break even at the world price of sugar, the premium value is pure profit.

To what extent will the \$10,053,700 finance Duvalier's bloodbath? How will the loot be divided up? Will any of it filter down to improve the lot of the Haitian in the cane fields? Why did the House Committee on Agriculture vote to increase Haiti's quota 50 percent higher than the level recommended by the administration?

The American consumers are footing the entire cost of this handout to Duvalier's regime, and they are entitled to a full explanation.

Another unexplained aspect of the Haiti quota is the role of John F. P. Clark as lobbyist. Although he is not registered under the Foreign Agents Registration Act at the Justice Department, Clark presented a statement to the House Committee on Agriculture—hearings, page 362—in which he identified himself as chairman of the Haytian-American Sugar Co., S.A., and purported to speak for the entire sugar industry of Haiti.

The Justice Department is trying to locate Clark to determine whether he was lobbying for Haiti sugar interests, and if so, why he did not comply with the law which requires that all foreign agents register, file compensation agreements, and give details every 6 months as to income and expenditures.

The high-profit of U.S. sugar business is evident in the subsistence living conditions of Haitian cane field workers. Haiti is so tightly controlled that no accurate agricultural wage figures are available. Wages in neighboring central American sugar-producing areas were estimated in 1961 by the U.S. Department of Labor to range from 7 to 30 cents an hour. Haiti is undoubtedly on the low end. Hourly wages for sugar workers in the United States, by comparison, range from \$1.25 to \$3.

Duvalier's people have a life expectancy of about 35 years, average about \$80 income per year. Illiteracy is about 90 percent.

Instead of going to better the lot of Duvalier's oppressed people, the U.S. sugar loot is more likely to wind up in the dictator's Swiss bank account. In 1963 a former associate estimated that Duvalier had already pilled up over \$1.5 million in bank accounts abroad.

He keeps control through his dread secret police, the Ton Ton Macoutes. Last year the nearly nude body of a rebel leader was dumped on a downtown cor-

ner and left for a day and a half as a grim reminder to Duvalier's foes. A prison for political prisoners reportedly has cells about 3 by 5 feet in size. The dictator reportedly cools off his critics by compressing several of them into each cell, sometimes for weeks at a time.

Until June 29, 1964, Haytian sugar interests were represented by Richard C. O'Hare and James H. Rowe, Jr., according to information filed at the Foreign Agents Registration Section, Justice Department. Rowe is associated with the firm of Corcoran, Foley, Youngman & Rowe, Washington, D.C.

PANAMA SELLOUT

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, apropos the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM], apparently any surrender, any appeasement, any international accommodation is to be applauded these days by some people. I am opposed to the proposal of the President which would be tantamount to giving the Panama Canal to the Panamanians on the basis of threats, demonstrations, and glorified blackmail.

Mr. Speaker, the sovereignty of the United States in the Panama Canal Zone is unquestioned and it is absolutely necessary that it be maintained for the proper operation of that vital waterway.

The proposal of President Johnson is shocking. It is not in the interest of the American people; it is not in the interest of world commerce, and it is a direct threat to the security of the United States.

NIGERIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the African Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for myself, for all the members of the subcommittee and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle I extend warm congratulations to President Nnamdi Azikiwe, to the able Chargé d'Affaires Godwin A. Onyegbula, and to all the people of the great country of Nigeria on this, the fifth anniversary of its independence. During my visits to Nigeria I have been fascinated by the charm of the people, the tremendous drive for progress that everywhere is manifest, the political maturity of the statesmen in every post of government. Ahead for Nigeria is a future of transcending brilliancy.

On the occasion of this fifth anniversary of Nigeria's existence as an independent and united nation surely all

Americans can add a special warmth to our congratulations and best wishes.

Early this year a Lagos newspaper congratulated the men and women of Nigeria as being "a people who have perfected the art of walking to the brink of disaster and pulling back just in time." There is more than a grain of truth in this wry compliment. We Americans, who have also chosen to govern ourselves within the conceptual forms of federal democracy, have ample reason to know how painful the compromises and how serious the problems of state's rights and territorial representation can be. We understand very well the grave nature of this spring's crisis in Nigeria and can fully appreciate the mature statesmanship manifested by all parties in its solution.

Nigerians have much to be proud of in the accomplishments of their fifth year. The young oil industry has shown rapid growth and is making very substantial contributions to the national foreign exchange reserves so necessary in reaching the 6-year economic expansion goals drawn up in 1962. A brand-new natural gas industry is steadily providing an inexpensive source of energy for powerplants and mills for more and more of eastern Nigeria. And in the north and great Kainji dam complex, with its modern town of New Bussa, is rising to provide irrigation, electricity, a fishing industry, and improved commercial navigation on the upper Niger. New roads and schools have been built and an ambitious, low-cost housing project undertaken. Furthermore, Nigerians can take a justifiable pride in the valuable contributions made by their nation to the deliberations and operations of the United Nations.

As with all nations, young and old, Nigeria has its problems nagging for solutions. Further constitutional evolution may lie in prospect, and this is seldom an easy matter. Localism and regionalism still have sufficient strength in the hearts of the people to compete with the broader appeals of the nation and of a national identity. Existing foreign exchange reserves are seldom sufficient for nations bent upon rapid economic growth. But a fine first half-decade's work has been done; an admirable record of realistic problem-solving has been established. If the past is any index of the future, Nigeria's next decade should be one of solid and accelerating progress. Certainly that is our heartfelt wish.

GUINEA'S 7 YEARS OF INDEPENDENCE

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, on October 2, Guinea celebrates 7 years of independence and I take this opportunity warmly to congratulate this young nation on her accomplish-

ments. To President Ahmed Sékou Touré and popular Ambassador Karim Bangoura go my sincere good wishes and my greetings on this happy day.

Because of Guinea's varied geographical regions, her economy is relatively diversified. Secondary industry has been growing in the Conakry region since World War II and a good beginning has been made in the development of hydroelectric power. The Konkoure River project, for example, will create hydroelectric power to be used in treating bauxite.

Guinea has encouraged the role of foreign investment in her development. According to United Nations estimates, Guinea's Gross National Product increased by \$12 million between 1960 and 1961 alone.

Social development has been considered essential by the Guineans. The Guinean army is used to build roads and to open new lands for people in remote areas. The government has established a social security system for workers and older persons. Free medical care is available for pregnant mothers and infants. Yellow fever and smallpox have been brought under effective control by large-scale vaccination campaigns. Many different types of projects are coordinated under the government's human investment program. Under this plan the people themselves contribute 20 days of labor per year to community projects.

The Guineans place great emphasis on the improvement of education. In 1961 about 25 percent of the national budget was spent on the development of educational facilities. The high priority given to education has continued since that date. The French educational structure and its traditional degrees have been retained, but important changes in content have been introduced to adapt the curriculum to local needs and to aid in the building and unification of the Guinean nation. African history and geography, for example, are important subjects. New schools have been organized to provide training in nursing, midwifery, social work, mining, and agriculture.

One of the most interesting features of the Guinean political system is the village council. Each village has a council of from 5 to 15 members elected for 5-year terms by universal suffrage. The man who receives the most votes becomes the mayor or chief. Regional government is also developing. Municipalities have elected councils and mayors. At the head of the national government is the President, elected for a term of 7 years. He is assisted by a cabinet, members of which are debarred from membership in the National Assembly, although they may attend and speak at its meetings.

Guinea was admitted to United Nations membership shortly after independence and is a member of many of the specialized agencies. She has played a leading role in the Organization of African Unity.

Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the African Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs it is a great pleasure

for me to congratulate Guinea on her independence day. Congressman WILLIAM T. MURPHY and I were privileged to meet and to converse at length and in depth with President Sékou Touré on the occasion of his visit to Chicago some years ago and we have followed with interest his career of national accomplishment for his country and her people.

LAMAR CAUDLE

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, when I was chairman of the Subcommittee of the Judiciary to investigate the Justice Department in 1952, our subcommittee spent approximately 10 months hearing witnesses in connection with the Lamar Caudle case. The following is a quote from the final report signed by six of seven members of that subcommittee:

Every member of the subcommittee and its staff who observed Caudle and listened to his testimony over a long period shares in the opinion that he is an honorably motivated man. This does not rule out his shortcomings; he was weak, and the naive code of a country lawyer did not serve him well in the corrupting sophistication of the Washington he knew; he made errors of judgment, some of which played their part in destroying public confidence in the Government he served; and he swallowed more in the name of personal loyalty than any man should stomach. But Caudle never sold himself for riches or for power. If, indeed, he so much as skirted the edges of venality and corruption, he did more soul-searching about it than many of his associates who have emerged with unscathed reputations. And in every instance where the choice was clearly black or white, Caudle's choice appears to have been impeccably correct.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion this is the best article that Mr. Pearson has ever written—and he has helped to give a most deserving person a decent "break." It is too bad that other columnists have not followed suit. Lamar Caudle is a gentleman of the old school. I admire and respect him because I know that he is basically honest and that he is the victim of circumstances. With all of the heartaches and pain that he has been forced to suffer—all of the humiliation that he was forced to accept—he never became bitter. He still has faith in all mankind. So ends a sad chapter of life in Washington that began in the 1940's.

CAUDLE—THE MODERN DREYFUS
(By Drew Pearson)

WASHINGTON.—After Lamar Caudle, former Assistant Attorney General, was incarcerated in the Federal penitentiary at Tallahassee, Fla., in the Dreyfus case of the Eisenhower administration, Mrs. Caudle went from her home in North Carolina to see him.

"I tried to be as gay as I could," Lamar told me afterward. "I cracked jokes and tried not to let her know that I was hurt and humiliated. But I could see how shocked she was to see me in a place like that."

"And afterward, every time she came to see me I could see her just getting thinner

and thinner, just wasting away. She had kept the family together during all that time. She had scraped and economized and sold some of the family property to pay my legal bills. She had sat with me out in St. Louis through the long trial. Then I went off to Tallahassee.

"She waited till I got out, all the time getting thinner. And then she died."

PARDONED BY JOHNSON

Last week Lamar called me again. He was at his home in Wadesboro, N.C. And this time his voice was resonant and gay. President Johnson had just given him a pardon.

"If you get to heaven before I do," he said, "please do a little lobbying for me. I think I've got one foot in the door, thanks to Lyndon Johnson, and maybe you can get me in the rest of the way."

A good many years have passed—almost 18 to be exact—since the day I first went to see Lamar Caudle, then Assistant Attorney General in charge of taxes, regarding the case of Irving Sachs, the St. Louis shoe manufacturer. It was the tax fraud case which was to bring deep tragedy to his life.

Since the case was one of the most famous criminal prosecutions brought by the Eisenhower administration, the story may be worth reviewing now.

Caudle was quite frank in telling me 18 years ago that he had received pressure to settle the case. The pressure, it was revealed later, had been in the form of telephone calls from Matt Connelly, Harry Truman's appointment secretary. Later it developed that Connelly had received two suits of clothes and a topcoat from Sachs.

Caudle received nothing. When the case came up for trial, Sachs pleaded guilty, which certainly indicated there had been no settlement as far as Caudle was concerned. U.S. Judge Roy Harper gave him a \$40,000 fine and a suspended sentence.

FIRE BY TRUMAN

Those were the days when Harry Truman didn't like me. One day Caudle was lunching at my home when he got a phone call that the President had accepted his resignation. Truman was like that. He could be extremely loyal as he was to Connelly, but he could shoot from the hip if he thought someone was crossing him.

Later, Dwight D. Eisenhower campaigned against the Democrats with the slogan of "Communism, Corruption, and Korea," and after his election faced the problem of proving corruption.

A grand jury indicted Connelly, and in order to prove a conspiracy, threw Lamar Caudle into the indictment too. The charge against him was that he had "denied the Government his best services."

Before the trial was over, the judge, Rubey Hulen, of the U.S. district court, shot and killed himself. I went out to St. Louis to interview Dr. James N. Haddock, who had Judge Hulen under psychiatric care. He said that during the trial he had given him heavy doses of paraldehyde, a hypnotic, to keep his nerves steady. He said that the trial had depressed Hulen, that he should not have been sitting.

SUBSTITUTE SENT IN

Ordinarily, the suicide of a sitting judge would have been grounds for a mistrial. However, since the judge was not alive, he could not rule. The Justice Department ruled, and it decreed that the case should proceed. The jury had brought in a verdict of guilty and a new judge was appointed to read the evidence and pronounce sentence.

The procedure was unusual. However, the Eisenhower administration had to prove its campaign slogan of corruption. And this case involved the secretary to Harry Truman. The trial proceeded. Caudle and Connelly were sent to jail.

Later it was revealed that Sherman Adams, a more important assistant to Eisenhower than Connelly was to Truman, had received several suits of clothes, a vicuna coat, rugs, hotel entertainment, and many cases of scotch from Bernard Goldfine, for whom Adams had intervened at the Federal Trade Commission in a criminal case.

Adams resigned but was never prosecuted. Lamar Caudle, who received nothing, remained in jail, lost his wife and suffered paralyzing financial losses. President Kennedy pardoned Matt Connelly 5 years ago at the request of President Truman. But no request came from Truman to pardon Caudle.

Last week, however, President Johnson helped to rectify one of the greatest wrongs of the Eisenhower administration.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I missed, by a fraction of a second, rollcall No. 350. First, I wish to say that I would have voted "yea" on the rollcall. I was detained in my office in a conference with Senator HART, at which we were discussing matters of some great importance to the State of Michigan and to my district.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES DESERVE PAY RAISE

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 10281, with one exception, the pay raise for Members of Congress. In my opinion it is one of the most equitable bills to be considered during this session of Congress. I think that it is certainly not an adequate increase, but one that is acceptable to all parties. This bill, however, is a step forward, and helps meet our responsibility to the employees of the Federal Government.

The cost of living in this country is going up almost each month, and with each passing day it is difficult for many of our Federal employees to meet their day-to-day obligations. By and large the employees are dedicated, and represent the Federal Government wherever they may be assigned. They should be paid an adequate living in order that they can live in dignity and comfort with their neighbors.

To me the postal workers are perhaps the greatest good will ambassadors the Government has. They come in contact with more people perhaps than any other Government employees. The postal employees, and all other employees, have been giving a day's work, their full share, and now it is time we were meeting our own responsibility. I have not had one letter or communication in opposition to this bill. I rise, my colleagues, to support it, with one exception. The one exception is the pay raise for Members of Congress. I shall vote to delete this section, and I hope in all fairness to those concerned, that it is omitted.

NO SPECIAL WISDOM AT FEDERAL LEVEL

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the Great Society's drive to extend the Federal Government into more and more areas traditionally reserved to the States, the communities, and, indeed, to the individual citizen, is arousing misgivings and concern across the country. An excellent editorial on this question as it applies to education appeared in the Concord Monitor, September 24. As its take-off point, it uses a quotation attributed to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] to the effect that it is preferable to have a—presumably higher caliber—Federal education agency making the decisions in this field than to accept the decisions of some local school boards. The Monitor, quite correctly, in my view, points out that while this might be true in individual cases, a wrong decision at the local level affects only one community but a wrong decision at the Federal level affects the entire Nation. This is an excellent point. I also challenge the notion that a Federal agency is necessarily a quality agency. People are people everywhere. Residence in Washington confers no special wisdom. A high official title with broad accompanying powers carries no special gift of insight. Indeed, the breadth, complexity, and scale of problems at the Washington level would seem to me to have the opposite effect in certain ways. The problems are so broad at the Federal level that no one administrator can hope to grasp them all and deal with them efficiently and wisely in every detail.

I commend the Monitor for its own insight and commend the editorial to my colleagues.

[From the Concord (N.H.) Daily Monitor, Sept. 24, 1965]

MUST WE ALL BE LIKE L.B.J.?

"I am no more afraid of the judgment of the Federal Government in the field of education—I am less afraid of it than I am of the judgment of some of the locally elected school boards with respect to the administration of education programs."

This is typical of some of the sounds being made by exponents of the Great Society who think all problems can be solved by Washington. Representative FRANK THOMPSON, Democrat of New Jersey, was its author.

When the Federal Government gets into the business of building highways across the country no particular principles are involved. But when the Federal Government gets into education, which is concerned with the minds of men, grave dangers are involved.

A local school board may make mistakes, but only one community is affected. A State school board may make mistakes, but only 1 of 50 States is affected. But once the Federal Establishment takes over education on a national scale, a mistake would affect the whole country.

Even if a federally established policy or practice is not a mistake, it does establish

a stereotyped pattern nationally and stifles the freedom which should ever be present in education.

Moreover, a nationally directed and controlled educational system is made to order for political abuses of all sorts. Patronage is only one possibility. The greatest danger is that an unscrupulous Federal administration would have the ready-made machinery through which to attempt to mold the minds of the young people of America to serve selfish ends.

Already, as an ever larger percentage of those who are being formally educated attend publicly financed educational institutions rather than private schools, public controls are tending to create the semblance of a national educational system as numerous standards are more and more widely forced upon local school systems and boards by State laws, which have tended to follow a consensus over a period of time.

The Federal Establishment is already pretty well launched in the business of public education. Its spending for education climbs annually, and its influence, exerted through the conditions attached to its grants, increases at an even faster rate.

Thus the freedoms so highly desirable if education is not to become sterile are being nibbled away by the application of mass production methods to something that must forever be kept individual, lest it no longer be education, but merely training, or worse, merely the promulgation of propaganda.

NOT EVERYONE IS FOOLED

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Concord Monitor provides another footnote to the apple harvest, foreign labor controversy in my State. The writer, with eminent commonsense, also ridicules the practice of giving Senators and Representatives of the majority party first crack at making public announcements of administrative actions with which, usually, they have had nothing to do and often were not even aware of. This goes on under every administration, Republican and Democratic, I freely admit, but I have always thought it absurd and compliment the Monitor. The editorial, which I submit at this point in the RECORD, clearly shows that the frantic, thoughtless switching and shifting over the apple harvest situation is not fooling everybody. Nor is the general practice of feeding administration news through congressional offices.

[From the Concord Daily Monitor and New Hampshire Patriot, Sept. 10, 1965]

A BLUE PENCIL CAN CURE THIS

Much has been said recently about the manipulations whereby Governor King and Senator McINTYRE sought to make it appear that through their influence New Hampshire was allowed to import some Canadian apple pickers.

Senator COTTON, a Republican, had announced that Secretary Wirtz of the Labor Department was to relax his ruling that foreign labor could not be imported. When

the day came Wirtz did exactly what COTTON said would happen. But in the interim the Labor Department at first denied any decision had been made and Governor King flew down to Washington for a conference with Wirtz.

This business of trying to make political hay by letting Members of the Congress and Governors announce actions by administrative departments is an old and much abused ploy. We doubt the public is much fooled by it, yet it must be, or the politicians think it is, or the practice would have died out long ago.

The news media could quickly put an end to the practice if they would. They could report actions by departments or agencies of the Government without mention of any elective officials except when the White House or the Congress is the action agency. All it takes is a blue pencil.

We do not doubt some Members of the Congress and Governors may at times throw their weight around with the result that they influence administrative decisions. But under law the responsibility for the decisions still rests with the administering officer, be he a member of the Cabinet or any other person charged with the execution of law.

Currently the ridiculous regularity with which administrative actions are made public by New Hampshire's Democratic Senator and Representatives, with no mention of the State's Republican Senator and Representative, is obviously childish.

Congress votes an appropriation for some purpose. In that action all members of the New Hampshire delegation participate regardless of party politics. How they vote is of interest to the public and should be reported. But when the agency which handles the funds figures out and decides just how much of the appropriation is to come to New Hampshire and what for, it is a department action and nothing else, and should be reported for exactly what it is and not be announced by third parties.

We don't know how Senator COTTON stole a publicity march on his Democratic colleagues in the apple picker controversy, but we'll bet there's still a hunt on by the Democratic administration for the traitor who, by his advance information to the Senator, made the Democrats look pretty silly. This was especially so as to Governor King's useless emergency Air Guard plane flight to Washington.

A CONSTITUTIONAL LIMIT

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, one of Tennessee's leading newspapers, the Nashville Banner, carried an editorial yesterday, September 30, on home rule, which I think my colleagues and the readers of the Record will find most interesting. I insert it at this point in the Record for their information:

HOUSE SUSTAINS IT: ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOME RULE, A CONSTITUTIONAL LIMIT

Home rule for the District of Columbia—a Federal city, almost literally defined as such by the Constitution—was rejected yesterday by the same Congress that has virtually rubberstamped every other legislative contrivance pushed by President Johnson.

To all intents and purposes, the measure is dead for this session; and by Representa-

tive CARL ALBERT's interpretation—speaking as House Democratic leader—it may well be beyond resuscitation for next year, too.

For reasons peculiar to Washington's relationship as the seat of the Federal Government, the legislation should stay dead.

That is no reactionary view, as charged to opponents of the change proposed; but an adherence to the elementary concept which moved the Founding Fathers to vest exclusive legislative authority, where this District is concerned, in Congress. While that provision subsequently was modified by law, it still has retained the feature of accountability there, with no independent municipal status conferred.

Indeed, it took an amendment of the Constitution—the 23d—to grant the balloting right, in presidential elections, to citizens of the District. Yet no such avenue was proposed for this home rule alteration. The method attempted was clearly a bypass, as discerned by concerned Congressmen; resisting it on exactly that ground.

Other factors aside—and they are both numerous and valid—this sufficed as a barrier to pressurized recklessness. If there is any city in the United States that should signify and symbolize respect for the constitutional structure and written law, it should be Washington. Its changing estate as a burgeoning metropolis does not justify haphazard treatment of political issues incidental to that growth.

As this newspaper has observed, it is more than a shade peculiar that the liberal elements should be busting a gusset to confer prerogatives of home rule upon a District constitutionally deprived of them while at the same time infringing on such where other communities and levels of government—including States—are concerned.

Thanks to Members of the House possessed of convictions on a principle as clearly drawn and sharply defined as language can make it, the attempted emasculation-for-convenience failed.

The Constitution still says what it says on the point challenged by this reckless bypass maneuver, and, regardless of expedient rationalization to the contrary, a majority both in and out of Congress obviously believe it means what it means.

PROMPT HEARINGS ON SITE OF JOHN F. KENNEDY ARTS CENTER DEMANDED BY 70 PERCENT LANDSLIDE POLL OF CULTURAL CONSUMERS OF THE NATION'S CAPITAL AND ITS VIRGINIA AND MARYLAND SUBURBS

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to declare my intention of introducing the joint resolution on Pennsylvania Avenue which President Johnson proposed to Congress yesterday. I compliment the President for his statesmanship in seeking at this time the creation of a Permanent Commission on Pennsylvania Avenue to oversee the development of this historic roadway. I find praiseworthy the fact that the Commission will report directly to the President.

Among other virtues, it should be able to avoid the continuous blunders of the

sort that have marked the planning of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. This project may achieve the status it should have by becoming rightly situated in the heart of the city, where it belongs, along the famous avenue now to be designated as a national historic site.

It was reliably reported in the Washington press in December 1962, that President Kennedy, in consultation with architects of the temporary Pennsylvania Avenue Council, gave a sympathetic ear to recommendations to transfer the National Cultural Center to the avenue. Therefore it becomes additionally appropriate that the renamed Center, as the sole authorized memorial in Washington to the late President, should stand on our great inaugural boulevard, along which he passed in life and in death.

All of this relates to the great upsurge of sentiment that has burst forth in protest against the inaccessible present site by the Potomac. The protestants include civic leaders who do not ordinarily lend their names to controversies of this sort, so we may be sure that their motives are lofty and their purpose is serious—such as the Suffragen Bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Washington, the Rector of St. John's Church in Georgetown, the leading individual patroness of the performing arts in the United States, the wife of the Deputy Secretary of Defense, the first vice president of the Washington Opera Society, lawyers, doctors, and political chiefs both Republican and Democratic.

And now they may be sure that their views—and the views of the American Institute of Architects, the New York Times, the Washington Post and the District of Columbia Federation of Citizens Associations among others—are backed by a large majority of the potential audiences that the Center is supposed to serve. I am offering the proof to Congress today, as I promised I would in my statement of September 7. At that time I proposed the first, and certainly long overdue, survey of the needs and desires of the consumers of cultural entertainment in Washington and the nearby areas of Maryland and Virginia. Today I report to you results so convincing and so significant that they will amaze even the proponents of a change, and confound those whose minds are closed to an orderly reexamination of the site.

SEVENTY PERCENT LANDSLIDE DEMANDS HEARINGS

By a landslide vote, a massive cross-section of the concert and theater audiences of the Washington metropolitan area has demanded a full-scale review of the Kennedy Cultural Center location before it is too late. An overwhelming 70 percent have voted for immediate hearings on proposals to move the Center to the heart of Washington. This is greater voting support than any American President has received in the 20th century. President Johnson, the Congress, and the trustees of the Kennedy Center are now faced with a mandate from the people who count and can be counted—the members of the audiences

who will spell success or failure for the Center.

I am sending this information to the White House, and I am hopeful that the President will seriously consider this firmly expressed referendum on the needs and desires of the residents of the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia. They are urgently entitled to a reprieve from the man in the bulldozer. He was pictured in yesterday's papers, poised to wreck a lovely recreational area of the Potomac Park riverfront as the first heavy step toward insisting that the wrong building be constructed at the wrong place at the wrong time.

The electorate that has been polled was assembled from the mailing lists of known ticket buyers furnished at my request by the American Light Opera Co., the Washington Ballet, the Washington Civic Opera Co., and the National Symphony, all of which expect to perform in the Center. Yesterday, the Opera Society of Washington decided to add its list to the others. These publicly supported organizations should be highly commended for offering their cooperation in a matter of the highest public interest.

OF 3,297 VOTES, 2,308 FOR HEARINGS,
989 AGAINST

In less than a week, 3,297 votes have been cast—2,308 favor reopening the question of the Center's location, and only 989 oppose hearings.

The response is remarkable in its total size. It represents about 10 percent of the 33,000 consumers addressed by mail between last Friday, September 24, and yesterday, September 30. This rapid and heavy response is considered to be extraordinary by survey experts, since the respondents had to read a long statement of pros and cons, furnish their own postage and sign their names and addresses. Many Federal workers are unwilling to sign their names in connection with controversial issues related to the Government.

In addition to card responses, there were many letters from thoughtful citizens, expressing their rightful indignation and frustration with the dictatorial tactics that have characterized the direction of the Center. Even on the cards themselves, many wrote messages of appreciation for being consulted on this important issue that so directly affects them. This gratitude came also from some of the minority that want to keep the site down by the river. This being no secret poll, I have invited the press and broadcast media and interested Members of Congress to inspect the flood of mail and form their own judgments.

THEY HOPE TO GO TO CENTER BY SUBWAY

In a subsidiary question, the voters were asked how they plan to go to the Center, once it is built. A substantial number said that they hope to use the newly authorized subway for this purpose. The rapid transit route recently approved by Congress will not serve the riverfront site now designated by the Kennedy Center. This response, too, is notable, because the consumers polled now travel primarily by private automob-

ile, a transportation medium many of them are eager to give up when theater-going.

I am sending this information to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. Yesterday, recognizing the need for accessibility, he recommended that the subway route be altered to provide a station at the Center. This should have been brought up at the time the subway bill was voted a couple of weeks ago. The route of the subway, which does not serve the Center, is part and parcel of the act as passed by the Senate and House and signed by President Johnson. If the Senator's solution is a practical one, that too would require immediate hearings on an amendment of the Rapid Transit Act. Certainly Senator CLARK, who was once the mayor of the great city of Philadelphia, should know that many thousands of Philadelphia Orchestra subscribers travel to the centrally located Academy of Music via the municipal subway which conveniently serves it.

BILLS SEEK 90-DAY REPRIEVE TO ENABLE OPEN HEARINGS

The hearings so decisively demanded by music and theater audiences should be held promptly. Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota; Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri; Representative CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, of Maryland, and I have all introduced Kennedy Center bills which call for such hearings, but so far these bills have been bottled up in the House and Senate Public Works Committees. I hope that the persuasive facts that my colleagues and I have developed will lead to immediate consideration by these committees.

Meanwhile, President Johnson or Secretary Udall, by a simple Executive order, could stay the imminent destruction of part of Potomac Park for a reasonable period of time. The bills introduced in Congress call for a 90-day reprieve. This is a small price to pay in order to prevent a possible national cultural disaster. There should be no assumption that such hearings will inevitably result in a change. The panicky behavior of the Center's officials makes it appear that they think that open hearings with expert testimony is to be feared. All fair-minded men should be persuaded, as I was, by the recent thoughtful editorial in the Washington Post, which ends:

Earlier suggestions of another site were withheld while the program was proceeding through the legislative and fundraising stages because no one wished to disrupt these efforts. Now that this phase is concluded a final look at other locations can be undertaken without injury or delay. So much has been done to fix the Center at the Potomac site that change may be difficult if not impossible. But the community will go forward in better heart if it is demonstrated by the sponsors that their choice of a site is so good that they do not fear a reexamination of the issues.

I would like to think that our distinguished colleagues in the House and Senate who serve as trustees of the Kennedy Center would also want the community to go forward in better heart.

DOMESTIC SUGAR INDUSTRY WOULD RATHER SWITCH THAN FIGHT

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, today's mail brought a curious item from the domestic sugar industry, which purports to include the following members: domestic beet sugar industry, mainland cane sugar industry, Hawaiian sugar industry, Puerto Rican sugar industry, U.S. Cane Sugar Refiners' Association.

Here is the text of the memorandum:

MEMORANDUM

To: Members of the House Committee on Agriculture.

From: The domestic sugar industry.¹

Subject: Import fee on sugar.

Date: September 30, 1965.

In view of conflicting reports concerning the attitude of the domestic sugar industry toward one aspect of pending sugar legislation, we consider it desirable to set forth our position.

The domestic sugar industry does not support the amendment which would impose an import fee on sugar. It vigorously supports the position of the President and the administration against an import fee.

Confusion as to the industry's position may have arisen because earlier this year it was advised by responsible officials in the administration that consistent with their announcement of October 19, 1964, there would not be administration support for sugar legislation unless such a fee were included. After much discussion the industry agreed to support an import fee of not more than 50 percent of the difference between the so-called world market and the domestic price objective of the act, with a 1-cent-per-pound ceiling.

Subsequently, the President determined that such a fee was inadvisable and announced his position to the Ambassadors from the Latin American countries. On August 17, 1965 the President said: "I will propose today that Congress eliminate the special import fee on sugar, so the full price of sugar will get to the Latin American producers."

What a stouthearted outfit.

Last March 29 this same resolute group, without a word about White House pressure, announced it was recommending—yes, recommending, not just "agreed to support"—an import fee as a part of its proposals for new sugar legislation. Full text of the industry's March 29 announcement appears in the Record, September 30, page 25713.

On September 30, same year, the same group now divulges that it was all a mistake. It appears the recommendation was made March 29 only because they were told "there would not be administration support for sugar legislation unless such a fee were included."

¹ Domestic beet sugar industry, mainland cane sugar industry, Hawaiian sugar industry, Puerto Rican sugar industry, U.S. Cane Sugar Refiners' Association.

Now they have switched, and want all to know that they were really against the import fee all along.

It all adds up to one simple truth: Where the import fee is involved, the domestic sugar industry would rather switch than fight.

And it leaves me wondering just what kind of pressure and motivation causes a giant industry to flip back and forth with no apparent regard for the interests of taxpayers and consumers? Does this group really speak for the domestic sugar industry?

It would be interesting to know the identity of U.S. citizens and business firms with special vested interest in foreign sugar quotas.

OUTSTANDING CLEVELAND LAYWOMAN RECEIVES MISSION SECRETARIAT AWARD FOR AID TO CATHOLIC MISSIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, an outstanding Cleveland laywoman, Miss Clara E. Westropp, was named recipient of the ninth annual Catholic World Mission Award in ceremonies held in Washington, D.C., in connection with the 16th annual meeting of the mission secretariat.

The presentation followed a 5 p.m. Mass at St. Thomas the Apostle Church celebrated by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Edward T. O'Meara, S.T.D., director, Society for the Propagation of the Faith of the Archdiocese of St. Louis.

The World Mission Award was given posthumously to Miss Clara E. Westropp who passed away on June 23, 1965, at the age of 78. Miss Westropp was a co-founder of the Women's Federal Savings & Loan Association of Cleveland and was serving as president of the \$142 million association at the time of her death.

Accepting the award from Rev. Gilbert I. Sheldon, director, Society for the Propagation of the Faith of the Diocese of Cleveland on behalf of her late sister was Judge Lillian M. Westropp. In making the presentation Father Sheldon quoted the following telegram received from Bishop Fulton J. Sheen at the time of Miss Westropp's death:

Preaching priests' retreat to the Los Angeles clergy prevents attendance at funeral. I feel a deep personal loss at her death. She gave me much missionary inspiration. She covered the world with her charities. Only heaven can exhaust the love of such a heart.

In 1946 Miss Clara E. Westropp officially organized the St. Francis Xavier Mission Association in the Diocese of Cleveland which includes the Deaneries of Akron, Painesville, Wooster, and Lorain. For more than 30 years she also actively aided the Little Flower Mission Circles which help the Jesuits in Patna, India. Both the St. Francis Xavier and Little Flower Circles organize women in groups of 12 each to work for the needs of an adopted missionary.

Miss Westropp's final mission activity was the formation of the Cleveland Latin America Mission Circles to support missionaries sent by the Diocese of Cleveland to El Salvador. Today these circles number 26. Under her guiding influence the St. Francis Xavier Mission Circles grew to 359 and the Little Flower Circles to 100. Miss Westropp was also instrumental in promoting the mission circle movement in Los Angeles, Chicago, and Detroit.

A missionary brother, the late Reverend Henry I. Westropp, S.J. who spent more than 40 years in India, was greatly responsible for awakening and nurturing his sister's great interest and enthusiasm for missionaries throughout the world.

For her accomplishments in Catholic action and her many works of mercy for the missions here and abroad, Miss Westropp was given the papal honor, "Pro Ecclesia et Pontifice"—for the church and Pope—by the late Pope Pius XII in 1954. In August of this year the Ladies Auxiliary of the Catholic War Veterans also named her as "Outstanding Woman of the Year."

A MORE BEAUTIFUL AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the greatest evidence that the American public deeply desires action for a more beautiful America is the fact that some 300 Associated Press managing editors invited the First Lady to come and speak to their convention in New York today on the subject of beautification.

They wanted to hear more about the redesigning and reshaping of American cities in a more attractive way and how we should carry out this work. They must feel their readers do too. May I remind you that their readers are also our constituents. And if editors wanted to hear more about it, I think that means all of us will be hearing more about it.

As the First Lady points out, "beauty" is a word new to the vocabulary of politics. But today, "beauty" is, to the editor, the biggest story in his hometown; to the businessman, it means a new life to the downtown area; and to the community leader, it offers a program to attract new business and new citizens. This important new project has widespread interest and support, both in the Congress and among our constituents and leaders.

I place in the RECORD the foresighted speech which the First Lady made today to the national convention of the Associated Press managing editors and commend it to your attention:

YOU—AND TOMORROW'S MAIN STREETS

Mr. Beebe, friends, there is method in my madness in accepting an invitation to speak to the most discerning audience in the world.

Frankly, I want to turn over some of my problems to you.

You see, a funny thing happened after the President's address on natural beauty. Everyone started doing something about it.

And, if you think your letters-to-the-editor columns bring a variety of opinion, I invite you to come read mine.

But, let me point out, all you have to do is print them. I have to answer them.

There are problems of zoning, of saving historic buildings, of enhancing the city's waterfronts and highway approaches that pour over my desk.

One lady wrote:

"DEAR MRS. JOHNSON: I've been writing to the city commissioners for 3 years about my big problem. Now I hear you have a committee to make Washington, D.C., more beautiful. Can you folks come over here and clean up the rubbish and rats in my neighbor's yard?"

One earnest gentleman described at great length his ability to make a machine which could eliminate junk automobiles with a "whoosh." Part of its design was a secret (which could be revealed if I invited him to tea).

Then a lady in Texas struggled hard to transform a small weed-choked island of city property into a lush growth of vines and flowers using the money she had saved from her grocery budget. For weeks, she donned her shorts and went out to weed and spade.

"From the women, I get compliments; from the men, whistles," she reports.

I won't take time to read you the thousands of serious letters from civic beautification committees, garden clubs and conservationists who report their activities. They are thrilling—filled with ideas which we try to pass on.

And they are evidence that a big hometown story is underway. I'm willing to spend my energies to help make it count for our country, but quite frankly, gentlemen, I think you are in a better position to do something about it than I am.

I have been told by some of your members to be quite specific. So—with your permission, may I manage your beautification news?

One of your distinguished colleagues, the late H. L. Mencken, once said he had spent his life watching the growth of the roadside jungles in our Nation and had been forced to the gloomy conclusions that the American people do not merely tolerate ugliness, but have a positive passion for it.

I cannot agree with Mr. Mencken, but I do think that we—as a nation—have just begun to accept beauty as a necessity to our vocabulary.

"Beauty" is a fragile word. Once, its use was reserved for the tender little lady who did needlepoint.

Politically, it has been an almost embarrassing word. Few men of business or politics would talk of "beauty."

Those who did were apt to feel like a 16-year-old boy quoting poetry, self-conscious and foolish.

Or it hung between the walls of galleries. It lay within the gates of parks.

Perhaps a combination of our affluence, our technology, and leisure time has given us the courage to use the word right out in public.

Beauty—to the editor—is the biggest story in his hometown. Probably the uncovered story. For we are just beginning to get concerned about the way the hometown looks.

To the businessman, beauty means helping the downtown area be orderly, attractive, pleasant, and alive—perhaps alive is the best word.

To the community leader, it means trying to attract new business with all the lures—water, recreation, a happy climate for families.

In the war on poverty, as we have raised the curtain on some of our most blighted

conditions, we have come to know how essential beauty is to the human spirit. You can find the human craving for it in small things and large. And you see the high cost of ugliness.

When I go into the poorest neighborhoods, I look for the flash of color—a geranium in a coffee can, a window box against the scaling side of a tenement, a border of roses struggling in a tiny patch of open ground. Where flowers bloom, so does hope—and hope is the precious, indispensable ingredient without which the war on poverty can never be won.

In our city areas, where people work, we may achieve a semblance of efficiency in a great, unrelieved complex of buildings which is no more than a gigantic filing cabinet for people and automobiles. But unless beauty is included in the rebuilding, the most important ingredient will be missing. We will not hear the sound of laughter which marks the soaring spirit.

The peril to tomorrow's Main Street is already at hand—indeed, each day, we are losing leadtime in acquiring the breathing room, the green spaces which will save our cities and their inhabitants.

The year 2000 is not a distant, improbable date of interest only to the authors of science fiction. We are only a generation away from that magic number; many of you will be around to celebrate—or to mourn—the turning century. By that date, the estimated population of America will be 300 million. Eighty-five percent of them will live in urban areas. One-third of them living in 10 metropolitan areas with populations ranging from 5 to 23 million.

This, then is the dimension of your biggest and most critical assignment, for what you do now will have much to say about how Americans live then.

You are the ones who can awaken, lead, and speak. You are the yeast of your communities.

Each day, the world is on tiptoes waiting to hear the news from India and Pakistan and Vietnam. But there is a big story underway in your hometown, how it will grow.

Consider the reader. The news gives him cause to worry and offers little he can do except worry. But the story of what is—and what can—happen in making his hometown more attractive can activate him into constructive help.

The climate for action has never been better. There is more imaginative thinking, working, planning on urban environment than ever before.

Let me just suggest a few things that help bring the hometown story to life. Many of them are already being done by many of you, but I would like to point out the things I consider most helpful.

1. Put able, knowledgeable reporters on the beautification beat. You can cover plans and alternate plans day after day, but finally little gets done unless the reader can visualize through perceptive reporting what they mean to him and to the State as well as his city. Good interpretation is needed. Some newspapers are already doing this and finding that it gives continuity to the story.

The alert reporter can often point to a spot where some shrubs and flowers will help bring color and beauty to the city. Not all efforts have to be big efforts.

2. Some of your newspaper seminars and State association meetings would do well to look into the wide range of stories that affect the growth of reshaping of cities.

They could establish contact for your writers with the experts—the architects, planners, landscape architects, conservationists. There is a mine of interesting information there. And your writers can learn more about the technical considerations involved so they can evaluate them. Newspapers share with these experts a great interest in the well-being of their community.

3. Nothing helps so much as pictures which enable the reader to visualize what is taking place.

I remember counting 26 broken windows in a Washington school. There was not a shred of grass or a bush to relieve the prison-like look of the school. But when Washington merchants took on the task of landscaping these schools and enlisted the help of students, no more windows were broken.

The story and pictures have prompted an effort to add shrubs and trees to a long list of bleak institution-like schools.

People will respond to the plea to save a tree, maintain a park, beautify a triangle, retain the view of the river, if they know what is at stake and know it in time. Consider the lessons of your own experience: how much ground has been lost for beauty in your city because the public did not understand what was afoot in time, and was confronted too late with the ultimate discouragement of the accomplished fact?

I think also of what picture stories can mean in helping along the clean-up, paint-up campaigns that get underway in many cities.

Recently, in Washington, some members of my committee helped organize 37 blocks in a low-income neighborhood. They persuaded merchants to contribute \$3,400 worth of paints and brushes, rakes, shovels, and brooms to the cause.

One summer week, there were 1,000 boys and girls and 200 adults enlisted to clean out the trash. Sixty-five truckloads were hauled away.

The rakes and brooms are all set for the next neighborhood.

But most of all, I believe the effect would be on those who worked at it. I think they must have a new pride in their city.

Taking a visual inventory of the city may help the citizen know what needs to be done and what doing it means to the city.

4. I would suggest that your readers might like to hear what other cities are doing about their problems. City leaders and reporters might go to see what has happened in New Haven, in Hartford, in Peoria, Sacramento, Rochester, Norfolk. Seeing and telling the story of how these cities have coped with problems will help you find the answers to your own. How to make the most of the waterfront for the people? How to find the creek that runs through the town where open spaces can be purchased and carved out for hiking and bicycle trails? How can the city buy some of it while it is \$100 an acre instead of \$1,000?

5. And then, there is the specific situation of your own plant. I doubt that there are many editors present who can look out of his office window and be pleased with what he sees. You are located somewhere near the heart of what the planners call center city. It is true that your editions follow subscribers into the newer and pleasanter areas beyond the declining business districts—where, incidentally, they go to reach what the city has lost—some natural beauty—trees and streams which get farther and farther away.

Some of you may count your readers in the satellite cities and the surviving villages. But it is downtown that one must seek the pulse of a city * * * downtown where you are. When a town dies, the newspaper is one of the first victims.

And when beauty returns to any part of a city, so does health.

I am aware that the statement is simple and the deed is not. There is much to be done. But the goal of rebuilding our cities into places to live in—not places to escape from—is a challenging one.

All over America, our great newspapers have a rare opportunity not just for normal civic leadership but for creative leadership in building an environment that enriches the lives of all the people of the community.

This starts with the man who carelessly throws litter out of the car window, but at its worst, it is large scale greed that squeezes out every drop of our environment.

It may mean fighting municipal vandals, prodding neglectful leaders, exhorting the public. But it is worth doing.

If our metropolitan newspapers do not care enough to fight for the very life of our great cities, who will?

The question is a fair one. And there is no doubt in my mind how you will answer it. Thank you for asking me here today.

ARE WE LETTING OUR TROOPS IN VIETNAM DOWN?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, last month I had the opportunity to spend an afternoon with our troops in Vietnam. It was a memorable experience. There was every reason to be proud of them for their leaders were excellent, they were combat ready and their morale was exceptional. All of this despite the fact that they were encamped in Vietcong territory, they were living in tents and the monsoon season had brought rains which made the base a virtual quagmire. Moreover, they were well aware of the sniping going on at home. They are there to win, the Vietnamese have gained great inspiration from our strong commitment to their struggle for freedom and the tide surely seems to be in our favor.

Spend an afternoon at the front and then spend an afternoon on the floor of the House of Representatives listening to my Democrat colleagues arguing against our efforts to cut off foreign aid to free world nations shipping into North Vietnam. You would have thought the sky would fall in had our motion prevailed. What is wrong with using some strong pressure to stop those who are supplying our enemies. American casualty reports and the whole prospect of a Communist southeast Asia seem to have little effect on our allies, especially the British, who put commercial and pecuniary interests first, principle and loyalty second.

I strongly supported the motion to knock from this \$4 billion foreign aid bill any payments to those nations who are supplying our Communist enemies in North Vietnam. I only wish the House of Representatives had shown a spirit in opposition to President Johnson's request similar to that which our fighting men are showing in Vietnam. If our men buckled under as easy as the Democrats in Congress, the war in Vietnam would have been lost a long time ago. Our effort failed, 164 to 174, with only one Republican supporting the Democrat position. We did not lose, the people did and so did our troops.

Over the past 5 years, I have continually pointed to the fact that there are blind spots in our foreign policy. A few years ago we were urging the free world not to ship to Cuba at the same time we were ourselves increasing our trade by 800 percent to the worst tyrant of them all, the Soviet Union. Is it any wonder that the nations of the free world think we are crazy? It is time that we show

overall leadership to marshal the forces of the free world against communism. We cannot do it on a selective basis. Nor are military considerations the only ones involved. Our overriding consideration should be the moral, economic, political defeat of communism in the United Nations, behind the Iron Curtain, in emerging nations and everywhere in

the world where their godless and oppressive system is challenging free people or the philosophy and principles of free societies. We lost a very good chance today to assume this leadership which is now lacking. While I have strongly supported the President's Vietnam commitment, the State Department's policy of selective retreat from

the Communists is one which is most surely a blueprint for catastrophe.

I am including with these remarks the statistics regarding the 1964 free world shipping to North Vietnam which indicates that 401 vessels were involved. Through August of this year, the figure is over 200. It is something worth considering.

1964 free world arrivals in North Vietnam—Summary of arrivals, by flag

Month	United Kingdom	Japan	Greece	Sweden	Norway	Italy	Netherlands	West Germany	Panama	Liberia	Lebanon	Denmark	Indonesia	France	Finland	Burma	Total
January	15	5	3						2		4			1			30
February	14	11	3		2				1		1						32
March	17	11			5	1		1	1		1						39
April	23	5	4	1	7		1		1		5				1	1	47
May	16	3	3		6	1	1	1		1		1					33
June	9	1	4		3	1											20
July	13	3	7		3	1	1	2									30
August	18	4		1	6		1	2		1							34
September	14	9			3	2	1	1	1					1			32
October	13	7	5	1	4	2		1		3							36
November	11	9	5		1	2	1		2		3						34
December	14	7	2		3	1	1			1	5						34
Total	177	75	36	3	43	11	7	8	9	7	20	1	1	1	1	1	401

CLEAN AIR AND SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL ACT

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, this has been a historic Congress. So historic in fact, that we have difficulty in keeping up with its recordbreaking pace. I do, however, wish to be on record as giving my fullhearted support to the Clean Air and Solid Waste Disposal Act which passed the House on September 24.

The legislation will serve as a start to the solving of two problems which if ignored have great potential for disrupting the happy and healthful life of our citizenry. The first provision of this legislation—the Motor Vehicle Air Pollution Control Act—gives the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare the regulatory authority to set standards which will govern new motor vehicles and engines. This measure is designed to prevent the United States from becoming a gigantic gas chamber. Today the exhaust pipes of over 85 million motor vehicles are pumping poison into what used to be our pure air. We who come from urban centers are well aware of this creeping contagion. Floridians have kidded about the Los Angeles smog but the growing number of exhaust pipes if allowed to puff unabated will also blur the sunshine in our Sunshine State. In fact we owe a debt of gratitude to our California brethren for they have led the way in this fight and 1966 model cars in that State will have equipment for the reduction of tailpipe emissions.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, in presenting this legislation, stated on the floor that:

The automobile industry has informed our committee that the industry will be able to meet the nationwide standards by 1968,

which means that it is anticipated automobiles sold throughout the United States during the fall of 1967 and thereafter will very likely meet such standards prescribed by the Secretary to meet this problem.

The hearings and report of this legislation give convincing evidence of the growing health hazard of automotive smog. The committee report states that the "total motor vehicle emission into the atmosphere will increase by 75 percent in the next 10 years if effective controls are not applied and will more than double by 1985." The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee also emphasized that although the basic responsibilities for air pollution control should and will rest with the States and localities, "the high rate of mobility of automobiles suggests that anything short of nationwide control would scarcely be adequate to cope with the motor vehicle pollution problem."

The second major provision of the bill deals with the subject of solid waste disposal. Solid wastes include a great variety of things—such as garbage, rubbish, ashes, street refuse, demolition and construction refuse, and wastes from slaughterhouses, canneries, manufacturing plants and hospitals—the flotsam and jetsam of our civilization. The bill would authorize Federal assistance in the establishment of a national program of assistance to States, communities, and industries for research, demonstration, and planning on solid waste disposal problems. It has been pointed out that less than half of the cities and towns in the United States with populations of more than 2,500 people have programs for sanitary disposal of solid wastes. Like automotive air pollution, it is a growing problem. The current national production of solid wastes in urban communities amounts to a half billion pounds daily, and it has been estimated that the total will rise to approximately three times that amount by 1980.

This is another area where this country is being pennywise but pound foolish. Approximately \$3 billion a year is being spent today for refuse collection by local government and private entre-

preneurs but less than \$500,000 is being spent to improve methods of solid waste disposal. All too often the committee report states:

Refuse is disposed of by methods that create unhealthful, insanitary, and unsightly environmental conditions. Such practices contribute to air, water, and soil pollution and create breeding places for disease-carrying insects and rodents. Accumulations of litter, refuse, and junk cause fire hazards, contribute to accidents, and destroy the beauty of cities and the countryside.

What this legislation envisions as a role for the Federal Government is that for which it is best fitted—providing assistance for research and demonstration which will bring to the States and localities—and interstate agencies—the latest scientific knowledge and creative thinking on the best methods of conversion and safe, healthful, and economic utilization of solid wastes.

The bill which passed the House last Friday is a major step in bringing the new society into being. The society that we would impose on future generations without this legislation would envision Americans with their heads in the smog and their feet in the dump.

URGENT NEED FOR CHANGE IN STATUS OF MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, the administration and the Department of Commerce have, for some time, been in the throes of study and discussion seeking to arrive at a national maritime policy which can restore some stability to our foundering maritime industry. Certainly, a national maritime policy which would face up to the problems

and needs of American shipping and shipbuilding is devoutly to be desired. The present handling of this most important segment of our national economy leaves much to be deplored. Unless great improvement in the handling of the Nation's maritime affairs is speedily effected, the dwindling commercial fleet which now carries less than 10 percent of our country's commerce can be expected to continue its downward trend of the past 4 years.

The chief reason for so many of our maritime problems, I am convinced, is that this formerly independent agency was relegated under Presidential Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1961 to a relatively minor position in the Department of Commerce, subject to the overall control of the Secretary of Commerce.

Frankly, this system of organization has not worked out at all. Under a Secretary who apparently came into office with preconceived views antagonistic to the maritime policy set by the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, the industry sank year by year to a present status that is inadequate to meet either the demands of our commerce or the needs of any military emergency.

Even under a Secretary of Commerce who apparently recognizes the plight of the merchant marine and appears to be disposed to do his best to reverse the downward trend, I believe the cards are stacked against the industry because of the 1961 plan's subjection of the Federal Maritime Administration to its present secondary position.

Accordingly, I have sent to the desk a bill that would restore the independence, dignity, and authority of the Maritime Administration by again making it an independent Federal agency whose policies and discussions would not be subject to review and negation by the Secretary of Commerce. I do this with all possible appreciation of the views and efforts of the present Secretary but with the definite conviction that the establishment of an independent Maritime Administration will be in the interest of both the maritime industry and of the entire country.

HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this brief opportunity to express my appreciation to all those who yesterday supported my bill, H.R. 10115, and which now goes to the other body as a substitute for S. 1118.

As I have said so many times, in my judgment, the legislation which was approved yesterday is the nearest expression to complete local self-government that has been embodied in any of the 35 bills which were considered by the House District Committee in this session. I

say this because it is the people of Washington who will be able to express themselves positively, first, whether or not they want home rule and, second, whether or not they approve the format or charter which will be drafted and which will be submitted to them for approval or disapproval.

For the information of the Members, and because there have been so many inquiries as to the exact provisions of my bill, briefly I will say they are as follows:

This bill provides for a referendum, not later than 100 days after enactment, to determine if the residents of the District of Columbia want self-government. The question on the ballot which the voters will answer is "Do you approve the creation of a District of Columbia Charter Board?"

As a part of the same referendum, the voters would elect a District of Columbia Charter Board. If a majority of the qualified voters approve the referendum, the Board would be created, consisting of 15 persons selected from a list of candidates on a nonpartisan basis. The candidates would be nominated by petition, signed by at least 300 voters and would be elected at large in the District of Columbia.

The Charter Board is empowered within 7 months of election to prepare a District of Columbia Charter establishing a municipal government for the District of Columbia, which would then be submitted by referendum to the voters for approval or disapproval.

In this referendum the voters would be asked to vote "yes" or "no" to the question: "Do you approve the charter?" If approved, it would be transmitted to Congress and would take effect within 90 days thereafter, unless meanwhile it had been disapproved by either House; or if both Houses approved, it would take effect thereupon.

Congress could only approve or disapprove, but it could not in any wise modify the charter as drafted by the District of Columbia Charter Board.

Complete legislative power over the District would be provided by such charter within the scope of the power of Congress acting as a legislature for the District, and consistent with the constitutional requirement that Congress retains ultimate legislative authority over the Nation's Capital.

Reservation is also provided for the Congress at any time to amend the charter, or for the people of the District to do so by referendum unless disapproved by Congress.

Provision is included for veto by the President of any legislation enacted by the municipal government.

I would certainly hope that the other body would take a good look at my bill. Since, in my judgment it is noncontroversial and does not include the specific provisions which were the subject of so much objection on the part of many of the Members of this body, I would hope that they will find it possible to approve the same immediately so that it may go into effect at once. Or, if it is the wisdom of the other body that a conference be held, I would hope that the approach

that I proposed and which was adopted so overwhelmingly yesterday will be the format as finally approved by both bodies and by the President.

MRS. JOHNSON'S CAMPAIGN TO BEAUTIFY AMERICA

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BURTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, often in our Nation's history we have had First Ladies who were gracious and warm and charming. But seldom have we had a First Lady, as we have now, who had all those qualities to unite the country behind essential causes. I speak, of course, of Mrs. Johnson's energetic one-woman campaign to beautify America. Thanks to this lady, Americans are beginning to open their eyes to their surroundings, and, for the most part, they do not like what they see. And thanks to her, Americans are beginning to catch a glimpse of what our country might be like if only we will decide to change it.

I call the attention of my colleagues to a recent editorial in the San Francisco Examiner which praises Mrs. Johnson as "a practical woman as well as an idealist in crusading for the beautification of urban and rural America." This editorial is typical of hundreds that appear every week in newspapers across the land. They are richly deserved.

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Examiner, Sept. 13, 1965]

URBAN BEAUTY

Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson, a practical woman as well as an idealist in crusading for the beautification of urban and rural America, has a good instinct about her subject, and people too.

Mrs. Johnson's major emphasis in her speech on beautification last week was more on the profit in attractive cities and countryside than on purely esthetic values. She knows the indispensability of things "good to look at" in improving the face of nature. She knows equally well the impact of a sound economic foundation.

Thus, these provocative and persuasive epigrams in her speech before the American Forestry Association and the National Council of State Garden Clubs:

"The ugly city is the one that will decline and die.

"The city that is beautiful brings a high return on the dollar.

"Preserving the attractiveness of a city is a primary economic asset, a way to get payrolls."

Few will be hard to sell on Mrs. Johnson's basic premise, that "ugliness, the gray, dreary, unchanging world of deprived neighborhoods, has contributed to riots, mental ill health, and crime."

Her words should be heeded in the older core cities of San Francisco, Oakland, and Berkeley, as well as the older suburban cities. Agreed, all these cities have more beauty than most other American cities; agreed, our slums and blighted neighborhoods are not as bad as those in the East. But it is not enough to look good by comparison.

The fact is that the forces of decay and uglification in bay area cities are still outpacing the forces of renewal and beautification.

A MISSTATEMENT OF FACT

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a minority Member who serves on the Domestic Finance Subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee saw fit to place in the RECORD a statement entitled "Banking Committee Revolts on Bank Merger Bill." The Domestic Finance Subcommittee has been sitting in session and holding hearings on S. 1698—a bill to amend the Bank Merger Act of 1960.

As I stated on this floor on September 24, I wholeheartedly support the distinguished chairman of the Domestic Finance Subcommittee and the House Banking and Currency Committee, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, in holding full and extensive hearings on this bill. I stated at that time, contrary to some of the statements that appeared in the press, that Chairman PATMAN was not stalling on the bill but was holding full and adequate hearings on a piece of legislation that, contrary to what some of the press reports, has not been subject to one word of testimony at the committee level on the Senate side.

Had the gentleman of the minority party [Mr. BROCK] consistently attended the committee hearings on this bill, I do not believe he would have made the uncalled for and in my opinion inaccurate statement that he did which appears on page 25718 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 30, 1965. This gentleman was absent most of the time when the Domestic Finance Subcommittee was hearing testimony on this bill, and it therefore seems rather hard for one to assume that he could be completely informed on the content of the testimony or aware of the superb and full hearings which the chairman has conducted on this bill.

Obviously a lot of heat and emotion has been generated on this proposed legislation. Many members of the committee support one or another of the various proposals that have been introduced on this matter. And as is true under the democratic procedures of the House and the rules of the House Banking and Currency Committee, which the distinguished chairman of our committee follows to the letter, any Member may at any time make requests to the chairman concerning legislative matters before the committee.

To characterize the desires of a group of members of the committee as being in revolt against the actions of the subcommittee is to me to say the least an unfortunate and inaccurate observation.

Had the gentleman from Tennessee, who felt called upon to use this word

"revolt," been in attendance at the hearings he would have been informed of the fact that the chairman has consistently indicated that it was his observation and best estimate that the hearings would be concluded toward the end of September. This is precisely what has happened, for today the Subcommittee on Domestic Finance met in executive session and reported out a bill on this subject. It is natural that proposed legislation of this nature, which so greatly affects the banking industry, would be subject to a whole spectrum of differences of opinion.

This is still the case, but I say again to classify this honest difference of opinion among the members of the committee as a revolt is unfortunate and in my opinion inaccurate.

I trust that the gentleman from Tennessee will feel called upon to restate his position on this subject as it appeared in the permanent RECORD of September 30 in a more accurate light.

SAVING THE LONG ISLAND WETLANDS

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, preservation of America's vanishing natural resources is one of the most important jobs that faces Congress today. Under the impact of our growing population, we are in danger of destroying much that is essential to our American way of life. Our majestic rivers are being converted into industrial canals and our marshlands are being filled for housing developments.

Obviously, we must find an enduring balance between the conflicting needs. Our industry must grow to support our population and our people must have homes. On the other hand, we must not in the process of growing wipe out all trace of our rich natural heritage. If we do not act decisively now, that is exactly what will happen.

Understandably the danger is greatest around our metropolitan complexes. The suburbs of our cities are reaching out until they threaten to join with other cities hundreds of miles away in one great urban corridor. If we allow this to happen and do not preserve the unique character of natural America, we will have failed future generations miserably.

In New York State, urban pressures and bad conservation practices have joined to accelerate the obliteration of our heritage.

My friend and distinguished colleague from New York, Mr. HERBERT TENZER, has come forward with important legislation to counter this destructive trend by preserving the valuable and irreplaceable wetlands of Long Island. These wetlands are important to the preservation of the once-rich fish and

bird life of New York State. They are a source of pleasure and relaxation for countless sportsmen. They play an important role in the lives of our children. If we lose this last natural refuge, New York's young people will never know one of the great joys of childhood or learn at first hand of the rich wonder of untrammeled American wild lands.

In his bill establishing the Long Island National Wetlands Recreation Area, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TENZER], has set a pattern of leadership for preserving such valuable resources. I am proud to join in the effort.

The proposal has been met with general acclaim throughout Long Island and from conservationists throughout the country. This support is typified by the following editorials, which, with unanimous consent, I would now like to enter in the RECORD.

[From Newsday, Sept. 24, 1965]

SAVING THE WETLANDS

The preservation of the South Shore wetlands—a prime breeding place for migratory birds, fish, and mollusks—has been a continuing object of concern to local government units and conservationists over the past 10 years. These lands cover some 16,000 acres of marsh and waterways stretching from Lawrence into the town of Babylon in a fairly continuous 15-mile strip. With State assistance, a large proportion of this land is already held in trust for the public, but under no hard and fast guarantee against its eventual disposition, perhaps for unsuitable uses.

Now Representative HERBERT TENZER, Democrat, of Lawrence, has proposed a bill to wrap up all these wetlands in one package under Federal Government control. They would become part of a Long Island national wetlands recreation area, to be acquired by the Government if possible or otherwise to be operated by the Government with a 50-50 sharing of costs. Towns wishing to do so could continue to operate their own wetlands. The plan would apply to 95 percent of the land designated by Representative TENZER. The other 5 percent, privately-owned, would remain unchanged in ownership if used for residential purposes or sold to the Government with the owners retaining use for 25 years or life.

The Tenzer project seems wholly useful. The State's cooperative wetlands program provides much the same protection and financial assistance, but it is based upon a minimum 25 year, leasehold basis that can be voided whenever the term agreed upon has come to an end. The preservation of the wetlands, virtually the last vestige of old Long Island, is essential so that future generations can see the dunes and the marshes, the estuaries and the wildlife that once spread over a far greater proportion of our land. Perpetual protection is the only answer, and the Tenzer bill provides this. It is good planning of the type now being undertaken by the regional planning board for Nassau-Suffolk. That agency has just been granted \$288,805 from the Housing and Home Finance Agency in Washington, matched by \$144,403 from the two counties in the form of personnel and physical facilities. This allocation has been a long time on the way. It now permits the hiring of a 13-member staff to gather basic information about Long Island's population, transportation facilities, housing development and land use. Such information is an essential preliminary to an overall plan for the economic and social development of the two counties. The money is welcome, and the results are certain to be invaluable.

[From the Long Island Press, Sept. 25, 1965]

GUARANTEE THE WETLANDS

Long Islanders should be delighted with Representative HERBERT TENZER's bill for the establishment of a Long Island National Wetlands Recreational Area on our south shore.

The bill, introduced Wednesday, would make almost 16,000 acres of tidal marshland—from the Queens-Nassau line to the Nassau-Suffolk line—a Federal conservation preserve.

Continued dredging and development threaten to destroy these irreplaceable resources, "A chance to walk, to row a boat, to fish, to hunt, to swim, to picnic, or merely to observe the natural world—all these must be provided for, and can be, even within close range of the asphalt jungles we know so well," said Mr. TENZER.

New York State, of course, and the towns involved have been working toward this same objective for many years now—and with considerable success. Oyster Bay has pledged about 6,000 acres and Hempstead town has dedicated 2,500 of its 10,000 acres for a period of 10 years to the joint State-town project. One big hooker is the fate of Hempstead's last 7,500 acres. Although the town has designated this as a conservation area, it refuses to permit joint operation with the State.

Another hooker is that the arrangement with the State fails to give an effective guarantee of perpetuation. After 10 years, it is possible for the towns to regain their original prerogatives.

Unless the State and the communities can guarantee that the wetlands will be preserved, then the best thing to do would be go ahead and make a Federal case out of it.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOME RULE: TIME IS RUNNING OUT

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, soon after the riots in Los Angeles President Johnson remarked that "the clock is ticking, time is moving." In fact, time is not only moving, it is running out in some areas. One of those areas is the controversy over home rule for the District of Columbia.

This week the House turned its back on a clear-cut opportunity to grant representation to the people of the city that houses the National Capitol. Instead, to our disgrace, we muddied the waters by passing a hodgepodge bill not understood even by many of its supporters. Its affect is to sabotage the home rule movement.

The clock moves on. We Members of Congress sit as a gigantic, unmanageable, unresponsive city council for the District of Columbia. The slums of our city grow worse. The crime rate increases. Hopelessness and despair set in deeper and deeper among the poor. We administer our city very badly and if the semicitizens of Washington, D.C., had the right to vote we would be quickly replaced.

Mr. Speaker, there is an old Mexican proverb:

Even a dog knows the difference between being tripped over and being kicked.

The people of Washington, D.C., are being kicked around and they know it.

With unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD some incisive comments on this issue, written by Thomas O'Neil in this morning's Baltimore Sun, October 1, 1965. I would draw my colleague's attention particularly to Mr. O'Neil's concluding paragraph:

President Johnson looks upon home rule as the liberation of the disenfranchised city, and its achievement as "the final battle of the American Revolution." It is a long battle.

The comments follow:

ONE MAN, NO VOTE

(By Thomas O'Neil)

WASHINGTON.—President Johnson's first congressional setback of the year came on a superficially lesser question, self-government for the residents of Washington, which is nevertheless packed with an explosive potential.

The central fact is that Negroes make up a majority of the population of the Capital, the Nation's ninth largest city, and that there is unrest under an absentee municipal government by Congress that often tends to skimp their needs. A lawmaker with a touch of Ku Klux Klan in his background, for example, has prevented participation by the District of Columbia in the Federal program for aid to children of the unemployed that is available to unfortunates in the rest of the Nation.

Such considerations were foremost in the President's mind when on August 26 in the aftermath of the insurrection of Los Angeles he said solemnly that "the clock is ticking, time is moving." Mr. Johnson entered the struggle for local government with greater energy than any predecessor in the White House, although all since Mr. Truman in 1948 have favored ending the system of the last 91 years under which Congress doubles as a city council. Both parties have for years included a promise of home rule in their quadrennial platforms.

The existing system holds elements of self-interest for Congressmen elected elsewhere and with no responsibility to the voteless constituency that lives in Washington.

Living here most of the year, the legislators are local taxpayers. Property taxes are substantially lower than in neighboring jurisdictions, while the city grows steadily shabbier. Liquor taxes, especially, are abnormally low, so much so that rumrunning into adjoining Maryland has an attraction disturbing to revenue authorities in that State.

A talking point against home rule was that locally elected officials would run up taxes to make demanded improvements. There was little dispute on this point. Instead, home rule advocates said, "You bet, and none too soon."

Taxation without representation is among the sorest of the grievances of local residents. It is exacerbated by the parsimonious payment permitted by Congress in lieu of taxes on Federal and other tax exempt property. The Federal payment of \$43 million accounts for 13 percent of the municipal budget, but Federal holdings are 44 percent of all within the 68 square miles of the District. At the turn of the century Congress contributed half the cost of the municipal government, but since has been paring its share.

The hard-core slums in the Capital are as miserable as any in the Nation. At the

same time the middle class Negro population of Washington, based in considerable measure on Federal salaries, is believed to be the largest in any city.

Washington governed itself for 72 years, a condition that was accepted as a matter of course almost from its establishment. The end came in a coincidence of an ambitious post-Civil War program of improvements and the panic of 1873.

It was then under a territorial form of government, with elected officials. It was also mired in the mud of unpaved streets, and without a central water supply. Conditions were so bad that there was a serious sentiment in Congress for moving the Capital to a better appointed city. The local authorities took fright and set out to remedy the worst of the conditions complained of.

Heavy borrowing was required. The panic—in the prissier language of today it would be called a depression—left the city unable to pay.

Turning to Congress, the city leadership encountered hard bargainers. Congress would foot half the cost of local government in return for cession of governmental powers. The local government went out of business in 1874, and 4 years later the change was made permanent by the act under which the District is still governed. No one in Washington has cast a ballot for local officials during the intervening 91 years. Sentiment for a restoration of a citizen-elected government has been frequently expressed in unofficial balloting, by as much as five to one.

Some supporters of the status quo insist that the Constitution requires that Congress run the city. The Supreme Court says otherwise. So did James Madison, who was in the best position of anyone to know the constitutional intent. His was the inspiration for a seat of the Federal Government removed from any State (all of the present District was ceded to the Federal Establishment by Maryland), and of the local citizenry he wrote: "A municipal legislation for local purpose, derived from their own suffrage, will of course be allowed them."

President Johnson looks upon home rule as the liberation of the disenfranchised city, and its achievement as "the final battle of the American Revolution." It is a long battle.

HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, the objectives of the highway beautification legislation proposed by President Johnson in his communication of May 26, 1965, to the Speaker of the House were widely acclaimed by all segments of the highway industry. They were supported in testimony before the Subcommittee on Roads of the Public Works Committee by the various State highway departments through the American Association of State Highway Officials, by the highway construction and supply industry through the American Road Builders Association and the Associated General Contractors, and by various highway user groups. The President's proposals were supported by these groups as desirable for protecting our investment in highways and for providing the State high-

way departments with the means to preserve and enhance the beauty of the roadsides and increase the pleasures of highway travel.

Serious questions were raised, however, about the effect the legislation would have on the already financially distressed highway trust fund and on the ability of the States to construct and improve highways as required to serve our Nation. Questions were also raised about the burden that might be placed upon billboard and junkyard operators who might be forced to relocate because of the legislation.

The bill reported from the Public Works Committee, which will shortly be before the House, retains the essential features of the President's proposals while at the same time satisfactorily answering the questions raised about its impact. The bill provides the means for a truly effective highway beautification effort without diminishing our highway construction program and without harm to persons or businesses it would affect.

The bill is effective and it is a consensus bill. It is supported by the administration and it is widely supported by the public. The broad base of the support for the highway beautification bill reported from the Public Works Committee is indicated by a letter I received from Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor informing me that the National Advisory Committee on Highway Beautification urges the early enactment of the beautification program. So that the Members of the House may be informed of this action and of the wide range of interests supporting this legislation, under unanimous consent I place the letter from the Secretary of Commerce in the RECORD with a list of the membership of the National Advisory Committee on Highway Beautification:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS,
Washington, D.C., September 25, 1965.

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works,
House of Representatives, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The National Advisory Committee on Highway Beautification by a resolution at its September 24, 1965, meeting requested me to inform the House of Representatives that the Committee urges the early enactment of President Johnson's Highway Beautification Program.

The membership of the National Advisory Committee on Highway Beautification is indicated on the attached list.

I am also informing the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Committee's resolution.

Sincerely yours,

Secretary of Commerce.

Enclosure.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON HIGHWAY
BEAUTIFICATION

Harland Bartholomew, member, ASCE, chairman, board of trustees, Urban America, Inc.

Henry D. Bradley, president, St. Joseph Missouri News-Press.

Walter F. Carey, chairman of the board, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 6125 Middlebelt Road, Birmingham, Mich.

Philip A. Conrath, president, Men's Garden Clubs of America.

W. W. Dumas, mayor-president, National Association of Counties, Baton Rouge, La.

Dr. Joseph L. Fisher, president, Resources for the Future, Inc.

Charles Gillett, president, National Association of Travel Organizations.

Paul Gingham, president, American Automobile Association.

Prof. Charles Haar, Harvard University Law School.

Richard H. Hackendahl, director, National Clean-Up, Paint-Up, Fix-Up Bureau.

Alexander Hamilton, president, American Scenic and Historical Preservation Society.

Ira H. Hardin, president, Associated General Contractors.

Mrs. William H. Hasebroock, president, General Federation of Women's Clubs.

H. E. Humphreys, Jr., chairman, National Highway Users Conference.

S. B. Hutton, Jr., president, American Association of Nurserymen.

Frank N. Ikard, president, American Petroleum Institute.

Pyke Johnson, Highway Research Board.

Morris Ketchum, president, American Institute of Architects.

Mrs. Mary Lasker, president, Albert & Mary Lasker Foundation.

Mrs. Harvey L. Lindsay, Associated Clubs of Virginia for Roadside Development.

Henry W. Maler, president, National League of Cities.

Harry Marley, president, Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel.

Mrs. Fred Mauntel, president, National Council of State Garden Clubs, Inc.

George Meany, president, AFL-CIO.

John P. Moss, president, American Road Builders' Association.

John H. Muller, president, Action, Inc.

Reuben L. Perin, president, Keep America Beautiful.

Seymour Rapaport, president, National Auto & Truck Wreckers Association.

Mrs. Inez Robb, columnist.

John P. Roche, president, American Iron & Steel Institute.

Morris L. Shadburn, president, American Association of State Highway Officials.

John O. Simonds, president, American Society of Landscape Architects.

Herbert W. Starick, president, American Society of Planning Officials.

Mrs. Robert Stuart, president, League of Women Voters.

Phil Tocker, chairman of the Board Outdoor Advertising Association.

Frank Vaydik, president, American Institute of Park Executives.

Mrs. Thomas Waller, president, Garden Clubs of America.

Peter F. Watzek, president, American Forestry Association.

William H. Whyte, American Conservation Association.

M. J. Mighdoll, executive vice president, National Association of Secondary Material Industries, Inc.

Harry A. Williams, managing director, Automobile Manufacturers Association, Inc.

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF NIGERIA

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FARNUM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, today is the second anniversary of independence for the Federal Republic of Nigeria, a

land far away but one which has many things in common with our own country.

As an example, Nigeria's population of over 55 million persons contains, like that of the United States, not a single people but a diversity making up a cultural heterogeneity of remarkable richness. Among those in Nigeria are the Hausa, the Fulani, the Yoruba, the Ibo, and other groups with roots deep in the history of Africa.

Although the Republic of Nigeria has a parliamentary government, it is of especial interest in the U.S. House of Representatives that the Nigerian Federal Parliament is composed of a House of Representatives and a Senate. Members are elected by universal adult suffrage, except for a northern region in which women do not now have the vote.

As in our own country, the courts of Nigeria are independent of the other branches of government.

We are reminded of our own pioneer days when we realize that Nigeria in moving from colonial status to independence is facing complications arising from the diverse nature of its geography, its climate, its religions, and its ethnic makeup. That the United States solved similar problems may be of some inspiration to it.

It is a happy fact that the U.S. Government policy toward Nigeria is one of cordial cooperation to assist in the orderly progress of the new country and to help promote the aspirations of its people for accelerated economic and social development. With our history, we could hardly do otherwise.

Today it is fitting that we extend our congratulations to the people and officials of the Federal Republic of Nigeria through its president, Dr. Nnamdi Azikiwe, its Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs, Alhaji Sir Abubakar Inuwa Wada and its chargé d'affaires, the Honorable G. A. Onyegbula.

REPUBLIC OF GUINEA

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FARNUM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, October 2 is Independence Day in the Republic of Guinea, an heir to empires which in the past were influential in Africa over areas as far-reaching as the Atlantic coast and the edge of the Sahara.

Of particular interest to us is the fact that although this ancient land is approaching its destiny by a governmental method different from ours, we enjoy close and friendly relations with the Republic.

The Guinea constitution establishes a presidential system within the framework of a republican form of government. In practice, Guinea is governed by its one political party, the Parti Démocratique de Guinée—PDG. According to the theory of "democratic centralism," it

is the aim to make it possible for every Guinean to transmit his suggestions and opinions through the party organization.

President Sékou Touré, as head of the PDG, has asserted the inapplicability of the Marxist class struggle doctrine to Africa and the necessity of freeing the movement of any vestige of European control.

There is a lesson to all the world in the fact that the United States respects Guinea's independence and policy of non-alignment in world affairs, and has agreed to assist the nation in various material ways.

It is fitting that on this anniversary of its independence that we extend best wishes to the people of the Republic of Guinea through President Touré, Minister of Foreign Affairs Louis-Lansana Beavogui and Ambassador Karin Bangoura.

BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE ON THE BANK MERGER BILL

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this morning the Domestic Finance Subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee reported out an amended version of S. 1698, the bank merger bill.

I would like to stand here today and say that our subcommittee hearings had resulted in a perfect bill. I cannot say this, but I can honestly report to you that it is a substantially better bill than the Senate version.

S. 1698, as amended by the Domestic Finance Subcommittee, eliminates some of the more flagrant and more unjustified exemptions from antitrust prosecution. It also insures antitrust protection in future bank mergers in a much greater degree than the Senate bill.

I am happy also to report that certain other amendments were voted to the bill. Most important is an amendment which will require the three supervisory agencies that pass on mergers to be subject to audit by the General Accounting Office. This includes the Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Comptroller of the Currency.

If we are to give these agencies this vast new power on mergers, then the public must have at least the minimum protection of an outside audit. These agencies have been operating virtually in secret and with almost no public accountability. The audit will be a big step in the right direction on this score.

I am also pleased that the subcommittee saw fit to include provisions for a review by the Congress of these agencies' budgets. This, too, will add to the public's knowledge about the operation of

these so-called independent agencies and will, I hope, make them a little more receptive to the public's interest.

Despite these improvements, I must, in all candor, emphasize my concern over many sections of this bill.

S. 1698, as amended by the subcommittee, still leaves Congress in the position of acting as a super legal tribunal, overturning court decisions and granting retroactive immunity to law violations. Originally, S. 1698, as passed by the Senate, contained retroactive immunity for all six banks currently under prosecution by the Justice Department.

Today's amendments in the subcommittee eliminate immunity for the three banks which initiated their mergers after the Supreme Court decision holding the antitrust laws applicable in the Philadelphia National Bank-Girard Trust case.

But, the bill still contains retroactive antitrust relief for Continental-Illinois National Bank of Chicago, Manufacturers-Hanover Trust Co. of New York, and First National Security Bank & Trust of Lexington, Ky.

In the Lexington, Ky., case, the Supreme Court already has decided that the merger is in violation of the antitrust laws and a divestiture agreement has already been signed by the banks and the Department of Justice. In the case of Manufacturers-Hanover Trust of New York—the Nation's fourth largest bank—the U.S. district court has found against the merger and the bank of the Justice Department have reached agreement on divestiture.

Now, we propose to overturn these court decisions and agreements and hand these banks a tremendous windfall at the expense of the public.

In addition to granting immunity for these 3 banks the bill also would eliminate forever the application of antitrust prosecution for more than 2,000 bank mergers which have taken place since 1950.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, this is not the type of bill I would prefer to report to the floor. Personally, I do not favor any legislation which might chip away at the great protection provided by the Nation's antitrust laws. Certainly, in the area of money, credit, and banking, the public needs more protection: not less. The antitrust laws have been a basic protection for the consumer, the businessman, and the whole American economy.

S. 1698, even as amended, casts some shadows on the validity of these laws in the banking field. I can only wonder, if we grant these exemptions in the banking field, what is next? Will the steel companies, the drug manufacturers, the automobile plants be coming to Congress asking for similar immunities and similar distortions of the antitrust acts?

S. 1698 opens the gate. We can only wonder where the parade of exemptions will end.

But again, I emphasize that S. 1698, with the amendments voted today, is a vastly better bill than the giveaway bill sent us from the Senate.

At this point I insert a copy of S. 1698 as it passed the Senate:

S. 1698

An act to establish a procedure for the review of proposed bank mergers so as to eliminate the necessity for the dissolution of merged banks, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (c) of section 18 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act is amended by adding after the seventh sentence the following: "The Comptroller, the Board, or the Corporation, as the case may be, shall immediately notify the Attorney General of the approval of any merger, consolidation, acquisition of assets, or assumption of liabilities pursuant to this subsection, and such transaction shall not be consummated until thirty calendar days after the date of approval: *Provided, however,* That, if an antitrust suit to enjoin such transaction is instituted within said thirty-day period, the merger shall not be consummated until after the termination of such antitrust suit and then only to the extent consistent with the final judgment in such antitrust suit: *Provided further,* That when the agency finds that it must act immediately in order to prevent the probable failure of one of the banks and reports on the competitive factors involved may be dispensed with, the transaction may be consummated immediately upon approval by the agency: *And provided further,* That, when an emergency exists requiring expeditious action and reports on the competitive factors involved are requested within ten days, the transaction may not be consummated within less than five calendar days after approval by the agency. When a transaction is consummated pursuant to the above procedure, no proceedings under the antitrust laws, including the Sherman Antitrust Act (15 U.S.C. 1-7) and the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 12-27), shall thereafter be instituted concerning the transaction. Notwithstanding the above provisions, any merger, consolidation, acquisition of assets, or assumption of liabilities involving an insured bank, which was consummated prior to the enactment of this amendment pursuant to the then appropriate regulatory approval or approvals, State or Federal, and where the resulting bank has not been dissolved or divided or has not effected a sale or distribution of assets or has not taken any other similar action pursuant to a final judgment under the antitrust laws prior to the enactment of this amendment, shall be exempt from the antitrust laws including the Sherman Antitrust Act (15 U.S.C. 1-7) and the Clayton Act (12 U.S.C. 12-27)."

Mr. Speaker, S. 1698 as it passed the Senate would have excused the banking industry from complying with the 75-year-old antitrust laws of the United States. Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of the Members to the last few lines of S. 1698, as it passed the Senate, which state:

Any merger, consolidation, acquisition of assets or assumption of liabilities involving an insured bank, which was consummated prior to the enactment of this amendment . . . shall be exempt from the antitrust laws including the Sherman Antitrust Act (15 U.S.C. 1-7) and the Clayton Act (12 U.S.C. 12-27).

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in my remarks a copy of S. 1698 as amended and voted out by the Domestic Finance Subcommittee today.

Your Committee on Banking and Currency will meet at 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, October 5, to consider this legislation as reported today by the subcommittee on Domestic Finance.

AMENDMENT TO S. 1698, THE NEW SUBCOMMITTEE BILL, REPORTED OCTOBER 1, 1965, AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR S. 1698

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert: That (a) section 18(c) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1828 (c)) is amended to read:

"(C)(1) Except with the prior written approval of the responsible agency, which shall in every case referred to in this paragraph be the Corporation, no insured bank shall—

"(A) merge or consolidate with any non-insured bank or institution.

"(B) assume liability to pay any deposits made in, or similar liabilities of, any non-insured bank or institution.

"(C) transfer assets to any noninsured bank or institution in consideration of the assumption of liabilities for any portion of the deposits made in such insured bank.

"(2) No insured bank shall merge or consolidate with any other insured bank or, either directly or indirectly, acquire the assets of, or assume liability to pay any deposits made in, any other insured bank except with the prior written approval of the responsible agency, which shall be—

"(A) the Comptroller of the Currency if the acquiring, assuming, or resulting bank is to be a national bank or a District bank.

"(B) the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System if the acquiring, assuming, or resulting bank is to be a State member bank (except a District bank).

"(C) the Corporation if the acquiring, assuming, or resulting bank is to be a non-member insured bank (except a District bank).

"(3) Notice of any proposed transaction for which approval is required under paragraph (1) or (2) (referred to hereafter in this subsection as a 'merger transaction') shall, unless the responsible agency finds that it must act immediately in order to prevent the probable failure of one of the banks involved, be published—

"(A) prior to the granting of approval of such transaction,

"(B) in a form approved by the responsible agency,

"(C) at appropriate intervals during a period at least as long as the period allowed for furnishing reports under paragraph (4) of this subsection, and

"(D) in a newspaper of general circulation in the community or communities where the main offices of the banks involved are located, or, if there is no such newspaper in any such community, then in the newspaper of general circulation published nearest thereto.

"(4) In the interests of uniform standards, before acting on any application for approval of a merger transaction, the responsible agency (unless it finds that it must act immediately in order to prevent the probable failure of one of the banks involved) shall request reports on the effect of the transaction on competition in accordance with antitrust law criteria from the Attorney General and the other two banking agencies referred to in this subsection. The reports shall be furnished within thirty calendar days of the date on which they are requested, or within ten calendar days of such date if the requesting agency advises the Attorney General and the other two banking agencies that an emergency exists requiring expeditious action. After receiving such reports, the responsible agency shall conduct conferences at which

representatives of the banks involved, as well as parties who may be adversely affected or aggrieved by consummation of the transaction, the Department of Justice, and the other two banking agencies shall be requested to appear and be heard. The banking supervisory agencies and the Department of Justice shall exchange information and opinions concerning the proposed transaction, including their evaluation of factors in paragraph (5) below.

"(5) The responsible agency shall not approve any transaction under this subsection unless it finds that such transaction will not violate the antitrust laws. Except as provided in paragraph (7) with respect to lawfully consummated transactions, no such finding shall preclude a contrary finding by any other agency or by any court with respect to such transaction. The responsible agency may approve a proposed merger transaction only if it further finds that such transaction would be in the public interest, taking into consideration—

"(A) the financial history and condition of such of the banks involved,

"(B) the adequacy of its capital structure,

"(C) its future earnings prospects,

"(D) the general character of its management,

"(E) the convenience and needs of the community to be served, and

"(F) whether or not its corporate powers are consistent with the purposes of this Act."

"(6) The responsible agency shall immediately notify the Attorney General of any approval by it pursuant to this subsection of a proposed merger transaction. If the agency has found that it must act immediately to prevent the probable failure of one of the banks involved and reports on the competitive factors have been dispensed with, the transaction may be consummated immediately upon approval by the agency. If the agency has advised the Attorney General and the other two banking agencies of the existence of any emergency requiring expeditious action and has requested reports on the competitive factors within ten days, the transaction may not be consummated before the fifth calendar day after the date of approval by the agency. In all other cases, the transaction may not be consummated before the sixtieth calendar day after the date of approval by the agency.

"(7) Any action brought to enjoin the consummation of a merger transaction on the ground that it would constitute a violation of the antitrust laws shall be commenced prior to the earliest time under paragraph (6) at which the merger transaction approved under paragraph (5) might be consummated. The commencement of such an action shall not stay the effectiveness of the agency's approval unless the court shall specifically so order, but if, in the absence of such an order, the transaction is consummated prior to the termination of the litigation, such consummation shall not prejudice the granting by the court of a decree requiring that the resulting bank be resolved into two or more banks, or other appropriate relief. Upon the consummation of a merger transaction in compliance with this subsection and after the termination of any antitrust litigation commenced within the period prescribed in this paragraph, or upon the termination of such period if no such litigation is commenced therein, the transaction may not thereafter be attacked in any judicial proceeding on the ground that it alone and of itself constituted a violation of section 1 of the Sherman Antitrust Act (15 U.S.C. 1) or the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 12-27).

"(8) For the purposes of this subsection, the term 'antitrust laws' means the Act of

July 2, 1890 (the Sherman Antitrust Act, 15 U.S.C. 1-7), the Act of October 15, 1914 (the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. 12-27), and any other Acts in pari materia.

"(9) Each of the responsible agencies shall include in its annual report to the Congress a description of each merger transaction received and each merger transaction approved by it during the period covered by the report, along with the following information:

"(A) the name and total resources of each bank involved;

"(B) whether a report was submitted by the Attorney General under paragraph (4), and, if so, a summary by the Attorney General of the substance of such report;

"(C) a statement by the responsible agency of the basis for its approval; and

"(D) a statement of the positions taken by participants in the conference."

(b) Section 18 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(i) (1) No insured State nonmember bank (except a District bank) shall, without the prior consent of the Corporation, reduce the amount or retire any part of its common or preferred capital stock, or retire any part of its capital notes or debentures.

"(2) No insured bank shall convert into an insured State bank if its capital stock or its surplus will be less than the capital stock or surplus, respectively, of the converting bank at the time of the shareholder's meeting approving such conversion, without the prior written consent of—

"(A) the Comptroller of the Currency if the resulting bank is to be a District bank.

"(B) the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System if the resulting bank is to be a State member bank (except a District bank).

"(C) the Corporation if the resulting bank is to be a State nonmember insured bank (except a District bank).

"(3) Without the prior written consent of the Corporation, no insured bank shall convert into a noninsured bank or institution."

"(4) In granting or withholding consent under this subsection, the responsible agency shall consider—

"(A) the financial history and condition of the bank,

"(B) the adequacy of its capital structure,

"(C) its future earnings prospects,

"(D) the general character of its management,

"(E) the convenience and needs of the community to be served, and

"(F) whether or not its corporate powers are consistent with the purposes of this Act."

SEC. 2. Any merger, consolidation, acquisition of assets, or assumption of liabilities involving an insured bank which was consummated prior to June 17, 1963, the bank resulting from which has not been dissolved or divided and has not effected a sale or distribution of assets and has not taken any other similar action pursuant to a final judgment under the antitrust laws prior to the enactment of this Act, shall be conclusively presumed to have not been in violation of the antitrust laws.

SEC. 3. To insure the fullest protection of the public interest in the administration by the banking agencies of their powers to act on merger transactions—

(1) section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U.S.C. 846) is amended by inserting "Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency; the twelve Federal Reserve banks (including branches thereof); the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System;" immediately after "Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation;"

(2) section 201 of such Act (31 U.S.C. 856) is amended by inserting "and" immediately before "(4)", and by striking "and (5) Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation".

**ANALYSIS: NEW SUBCOMMITTEE BILL REPORTED
OCTOBER 1, 1965**

1. [(c)(1-2)]: Insured banks cannot merge without approval of responsible banking agency (Fed, FDIC, or Comptroller).

2. [(c)(3)]: Notice of bank merger transaction must be published by banks prior to merger.

3. [(c)(4)]: Responsible agency must request a report from Attorney General and other two agencies on the effect of merger on competition in accordance with antitrust standards.

4. [(c)(4)]: After reports are received, the responsible agency must hold a conference with banks involved, other banking agencies, the Justice Department, and other interested parties. Justice and the banking agencies shall exchange views on the transaction including a consideration of banking factors.

5. [(c)(5)]: The responsible agency cannot approve transaction unless it finds no antitrust violation; this finding is not to be binding on any other agency or court. If the responsible agency further finds the merger in the public interest considering the banking factors, it may approve merger.

6. [(c)(6)]: Approvals of mergers must be given to the Attorney General and the merger may not be consummated for 60 days after such approval.

7. [(c)(7)]: An antitrust suit may be brought by the Department of Justice or private party prior to the approved consummation date. No automatic injunction results from the bringing of suit.

Upon the termination of the litigation or the statutory period, the original merger transaction may not be attacked under section 1 of the Sherman Act or section 7 of the Clayton Act.

8. [(c)(9)]: Banking agencies shall include in their annual report full information on their action on merger applications.

9. [Section 18(i)(1-4)]: Provides that the responsible agency must approve the reduction of capital structure, change of insured status, or convert from national to State bank.

10. [Section 2]: Bank mergers prior to the Philadelphia Bank decision (June 17, 1963) are excused from antitrust prosecution.

11. [Section 3]: Banking agencies shall be subject to appropriation and audit control under the Government Corporations Act as per the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

TARIFFS AND THE GLASS INDUSTRY

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to again call to the attention of Congress the serious matter of "tariffs and the glass industry."

With the help of my colleagues, the gentleman from Oklahoma, Congressman EDMONDSON, the gentleman from California, Congressman SISK, the gentleman from West Virginia, Congressman MOORE, and the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman HAYS, and others contributing their share, we were able to impress President Kennedy with the

seriousness of the import impact upon the glass industry.

As a result, President Kennedy ordered an increase in the glass tariffs going back to rates established over 30 years ago. This was done to keep the U.S. flat glass industry from disappearing completely from the American scene.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are again being pushed to the edge of oblivion by the ever grasping, greedy hands of the international trader described all too often as the do-gooder, world thinker, peace seeker, but who in truth is nothing but a profit seeking merchant ready and willing to sell anything including the American workman for a fast profit.

The President has before him at this moment one of the latest pro-free trade, anti-American worker decisions of the Tariff Commission urging him to undo President Kennedy's action in saving the glass industry and in the name of free trade, turn the U.S. worker out into the streets.

Mr. Speaker, the citizens of my district, particularly in Arnold, New Kensington, and Jeannette, are greatly disturbed by this latest Tariff Commission action. The Commission, by a split decision 3-to-2 vote, decided unanimously that injury to the U.S. glass industry would be the inevitable result of the President's action in cutting tariffs on glass, but after admitting this much, then they voted 3-to-2 to go ahead and kill off our glass plants.

Mr. Speaker, just a few years ago we had 40 glass producers in the United States. Now we have four. How much do we have to give before the greed of the international trader and his monopolistic cartel is satisfied.

Just 2 days ago I addressed the House on the subject of the auto and parts pact with Canada. The next day the great promoter of free trade and my critic because of my fight for U.S. parity in world trade, the Washington Post, editorialized against this disastrous free trade deal which, if followed up in the usual manner by the European and Japanese merchants, will push the U.S. automobile worker to the wall and force our industry to build more and more foreign-based plants.

If this is not enough to awaken the U.S. Congress, I suggest the Members read my talk on the Canadian bonanza in the RECORD of September 29, page 25454, the following resolution from the city of Arnold, and last, but not least, the latest decision of the Secretary of Commerce in the matter of walnut log exports.

The latest statement on the subject of walnut logs, veneers, and American production policies is by far the most illogical conclusion ever reached in a decision that has as its base two premises: First, that U.S. veneer manufacturers were bad boys and some of them did not keep a bargain; and, second, that since walnut veneers can be replaced by synthetics and substitutes why worry about the U.S. veneer industry.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this all started to be a few remarks about my glassworkers, my glass plants and my people at home. However, I find that wherever I

turn, I find injury from imports and when I talk to my unemployed workers in steel, glass, coal, rubber, and aluminum, I find that they really do not need so much legislation on manpower training, unemployment compensation, anti-poverty, and research. All they ask for is less free trade and free advice and more job protection against imports.

RESOLUTION

Whereas the American St. Gobain Glass Co. has a plant located in the city of Arnold, Westmoreland County, Pa., and employs some 1,000 workers; and

Whereas the city of Arnold has a population of approximately 10,000 inhabitants; and

Whereas the American St. Gobain Glass Co.'s Arnold plant is the main industry of the city of Arnold; and

Whereas President Johnson has before him the advice of the U.S. Tariff Commission indicating that tariffs on imports of foreign sheet glass could be safely reduced; and

Whereas the reduction of the tariff would threaten the loss of many jobs in the city of Arnold; and

Whereas the business houses in the city of Arnold would be seriously affected; and

Whereas the reduction of the tariff would help foreign sheet glass producers to sell even more in the U.S. markets; and

Whereas the reduction in the tariff rates would only help the powerful European and Japanese glass industry grow at the expense of the higher wage American industry; be it

Resolved, That the President of the United States disapprove any reduction in the sheet glass tariff rates; and, be it further

Resolved, That the Senators and Members of Congress from Pennsylvania give their support and disapprove any reduction of the tariff on sheet glass as presently exists; and, be it further

Resolved, That the city of Arnold spread this resolution on its minutes and a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the U.S. Senators, JOSEPH S. CLARK, JR., and HUGH SCOTT, and to Congressman JOHN H. DENT.

Attest:

WILL DENOO,
Mayor, City of Arnold.
ELMO B. CECCHETTI,
City Clerk.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ADDABBO, for Friday, October 1, on account of official business.

Mr. BOW (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for October 5 and 6, on account of official business.

Mr. KEE (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for October 1, on account of official business.

Mr. GRIDER, for October 1, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. ALBERT, for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include an address by the First Lady.

Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. HORTON), for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. WHITE of Idaho.

Mr. REUSS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HORTON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CEDERBERG in two instances.

Mr. BELL.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. STALBAUM) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. TODD in two instances.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois.

Mr. POWELL in two instances.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1314. An act to amend the Street Readjustment Act of the District of Columbia so as to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to close all or part of a street, road, highway, or alley in accordance with the requirements of an approved redevelopment or urban renewal plan, without regard to the notice provisions of such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1719. An act to authorize compensation for overtime work performed by officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police force, and the White House Police force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1384. An act for the relief of Theodore Zissu; and

H.R. 6726. An act for the relief of William S. Perrigo.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2580. An act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, October 5, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1636. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Property and Installations), transmitting notification of the location, nature, and estimated cost of certain additional facilities projects proposed to be undertaken for the Air National Guard, pursuant to Public Law 88-390; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1637. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting information on contracts negotiated for experimental, developmental, or research work or for the manufacturing or furnishing of property for this purpose during the 6-month period ended June 30, 1965, pursuant to section 302, 63 Stat. 377 as amended (5 U.S.C. 630); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1638. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of potential savings through use of an oversupply of stabilator assemblies for F-4 aircraft, Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1639. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of additional income possible by obtaining more equitable rates of interest on U.S.-owned foreign currencies, Treasury Department, Department of State, and Agency for International Development; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1640. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of costs incurred in procuring MADREC electronic system components manufactured by Midwestern Instruments, Inc., from Lockheed-Georgia Co., Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1641. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of improvement to be made in administration of employee travel, Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1642. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible to the United States, pursuant to the provisions of section 212(a) (28) (I) (ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1643. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend and clarify the reemployment provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1644. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the establishment of Federal savings banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MORRISON: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 11300. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide certain mailing privileges with respect to members of the U.S. Armed Forces, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1113). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 706. A bill to amend the Railway Labor Act in order to provide for establishment of special adjustment boards upon the request either of representatives of employees or of carriers to resolve disputes otherwise referable to the National Railroad Adjustment Board; with amendment (Rept. No. 1114). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee of conference. H.R. 9042. An act to provide for the implementation of the Agreement Concerning Automotive Products Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1115). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 2118. An act to amend sections 9 and 37 of the Shipping Act, 1916, and subsection O of the Ship Mortgage Act, 1920; with amendment (Rept. No. 1116). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 11407. A bill to provide financial assistance to the States to assist them in establishing treatment and rehabilitation services for drug abusers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 11408. A bill to provide financial assistance to the States to assist them in the construction of facilities for the treatment and rehabilitation of drug abusers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 11409. A bill to authorize civil commitment in lieu of criminal punishment in certain cases involving narcotic addicts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11410. A bill relating to the penalties for violations of certain narcotic and marihuana laws of the United States, and to the treatment of narcotic addicts and other persons suffering from a mental or physical condition committed to the custody of the Attorney General; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 11411. A bill to provide for a program to advance the humane care, comfort, and welfare of laboratory animals used in scientific study; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 11412. A bill to provide loan assistance to certain vocational schools for the construction of instructional facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HAMILTON:

H.R. 11413. A bill to incorporate the National Society Daughters of the Union, 1861-65; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 11414. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 11415. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REINECKE:

H.R. 11416. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create the

Federal Maritime Administration and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 11417. A bill to provide for the protection, conservation, and development of the natural coastal wetlands of Hempstead-South Oyster Bay, Long Island, for fish and wildlife and outdoor recreation purposes; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 11418. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 as it relates to those areas to be designated as redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 11419. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create the Federal Maritime Administration and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 11420. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide certain mailing privileges with respect to members of the U.S. Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.J. Res. 678. Joint resolution to provide for the administration and development of Pennsylvania Avenue as a national historic site; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H. Con. Res. 518. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress with respect to strengthening the inter-American system; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

370. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin transmitting a copy of assembly joint resolution as passed on July 21, 1965, relative to ratification of a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to presidential succession, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 11421. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rolando V. Bernal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11422. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Irene M. Bartos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 11423. A bill for the relief of Erlinda A. Camacho, Emma A. Ladores, Maria Zoraida Tan, and Arsenia V. Tolentino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 11424. A bill for the relief of Gassi Gallo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11425. A bill for the relief of Giorgios Markopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11426. A bill for the relief of John Markopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

275. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the State of Arkansas Legislative Council, Little Rock, Ark., relating to payment of

in-lieu taxes by the Southwest Power Administration, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 1, 1965

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rev. Kenneth S. Jones, director, Washington area Methodist information, Silver Spring, Md., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, whose we are and in whose hands the nations of the world have their hope of security and peace, bless, we pray, the labors of this day, by these Thy servants so heavily charged with the general welfare of all in this land, and so strategically situated as to influence the destiny of the human race by their every act. Thou alone art Lord and God. We are mere men, Thy servants, seeking to do that which will be pleasing in Thy sight. Endow us and all men with wisdom from on high, enough for the responsibilities of this day, and keep us mindful of Thine eternal purposes. Coming to Thee in days of deep satisfaction for many good laws carefully fashioned for the common good, remind us from whence our help comes, and keep us humble in the face of accomplishment. Grant us such confidence in Thy sustaining power as will deliver us from obligation to any man, and lift us to an ever-higher level of dedication to the public good. Remold us into human forms that shall be acceptable in Thy sight, that all our days, begun, continued and ending in Thee, may be days that acknowledge our Creator. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, September 30, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Under authority of the order of the Senate of Thursday, September 30, 1965,

The Secretary of the Senate received the following message from the House of Representatives:

The Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 2580) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of Thursday, September 30, 1965,

The VICE PRESIDENT announced that on today, October 1, 1965, he signed the enrolled bill (H.R. 2580) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act,

and for other purposes, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9042) to provide for the implementation of the Agreement Concerning Automotive Products Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MILLS, Mr. KING of California, Mr. Boggs, Mr. KEOGH, Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, Mr. CURTIS, and Mr. UTT were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 10281) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, to establish the Federal Salary Review Commission, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 508) authorizing the President to designate the 8-day period beginning October 10, 1965, as "Canberra Week," in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 10281) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, to establish the Federal Salary Review Commission, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 508) authorizing the President to designate the 8-day period beginning October 10, 1965, as "Canberra Week," was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?